B

To Elliott:

"What every"

-Churchman-

"should know"

Texas 1912.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE KEY OF LIFE

GOOD FRIDAY ADDRESSES

THOMAS WHITTAKER

THE CATHOLIC IDEAL OF THE CHURCH

AN ESSAY TOWARD CHRISTIAN UNITY

THOMAS WHITTAKER

ASPECTS OF REVELATION

A STUDY OF REVELATION IN RELATION TO PERSONALITY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND AMERICAN LIFE

BY

CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER

BISHOP OF CONNECTICUT

LIBRARY OF
Kenyon Theological Seminary

HN
64
.B82
1912

22,899

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER, INC.
1912

Copyright, 1912, by
THOMAS WHITTAKER, INC.

"Yes, East and West, and North and South, the palm and the pine, the pole and the equator, the crescent and the cross—how the great Alchemist melts and fuses them with his purging flame! Here shall they all unite to build the Republic of Man and the Kingdom of God. Ah, Vera, what is the glory of Rome and Jerusalem where all nations and races come to worship and look back, compared with the glory of America, where all races and nations come to labor and look forward!"

—"The Melting Pot." ISRAEL ZANGWILL.

PREFACE

Our politics the past year few of us in America can be proud of. None the less may one still cherish faith in American citizenship. The people would seem to be becoming weary of mere politics. Political contests as such are losing their interest in comparison with other issues. A quickened social conscience has recognized that under democratic forms and methods have somehow arisen conditions that are palpably undemocratic, and is manifesting an unwonted interest in human well-being. Meanwhile masses of the people are stirring in vague unrest and striving often aimlessly after they know not what. On the other hand, many persons are only bewildered spectators of the social movement of our time. They should be guided to intelligent sympathy and efficient service. On all sides it might be well to endeavor to mount to a new standpoint and a wider outlook. It may be worth while to suggest the possibility

that conflicting elements in our national life might be taken up into the synthesis of a higher unity. It may be worth while to inquire whither we may be moving and to consider the signs which point the way not to a circumscribed and necessarily restricting but to an ampler, a fairer and a more ennobling social order.

It were wise to face the fact that the social question is ultimately a moral question. It is time to recognize that its solution lies not in biological analogies, not in the exaltation of the State at the expense of the individual, nor again in the destruction of government, but in that gospel of the Kingdom of God which means the realization of certain ideals at once through social relations and through the highest and fullest development of personality.

There are here included papers prepared for different occasions. Chapter VI was delivered as a sermon before Columbia University. Chapters IV and V are here reproduced by the courtesy of the editor of the *North American Review*. More recent articles in *The Independent* appear, with considerable change,

as Chapters VII and VIII and the latter part of Chapter IX. Under the circumstances there will be some almost inevitable repetitions of thought in these pages. The papers, however, have a common theme and purpose, and there will be found, I trust, a progress in their general argument. They are put forth because of my desire, as a minister of Him whose gospel was the good news of a Kingdom and as a citizen of this nation, to bear my testimony to the signal destinies awaiting our country if, in the face of any and every doubt, difficulty and discouragement, this people be true to the ideals and purposes of the Kingdom of God.

CHAUNCEY B. BREWSTER.

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT,
October 17, 1912.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

A CRITICAL PERIOD IN AMERICAN LIFE

A critical period in our national affairs—Questions touching not only political but also social relations—Their solution requires not only economic but moreover ethical factors—Faith in progress—True lines of progress—Changes not less real because evolutionary rather than revolutionary—The vision of the Kingdom ..... *Pages* 1 to 9

CHAPTER II

A PRIMARY NEED OF AMERICAN LIFE

Recovery of ideals and reinstatement of standards—Idealism of our earlier history and of many newcomers—Ideal honor of the ballot—Ideal of a courageous citizenship—Renewed ideal of loyalty—An ideal of the authority of law, as a living organ of society—Courts of justice and the popular will—Ideal of the family—Ideal value of human life—Significance of the democratic ideal ..... *Pages* 10 to 26

CHAPTER III

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH

The Kingdom of God in the Scriptures—Its institutional aspect—The Church, although not to be identified with the Kingdom, yet its expression and instrument—The Kingdom embraces other institutions—Yet the

Church's mission more extensive and intensive—Office of leadership on behalf of the Kingdom—The catholic brotherhood—Its mission obscured by considering the Church from a negative standpoint—Misunderstanding of the name—Temptation to forget catholic mission—The Pentecostal trust of power, to reinforce the life of men, to demonstrate life's significance and possibilities—The possibilities in collective humanity—Need of the witness of the Church as standing for ideals ..... *Pages* 27 to 41

CHAPTER IV

THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL AND THE CHURCH

Beyond democratic methods of government an ideal regarding human nature—Its authority—The Church's witness thereto—The upholding of high standards—The democratic ideal menaced by plutocratic influences—The Church's witness to righteousness in business; against sinister influence in politics; on behalf of civic duty—The Church's witness to the State—The Church to be true to the democratic ideal in its own administration; in ministration: its music to be not poor but more democratic; private pew *versus* people—In effort and sympathy the Church to be loyal to the democratic ideal—The Church and labor-unions—Democracy needs what the Church should supply. *Pages* 42 to 58

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL IDEAL

Individualism in the French Revolution and in the nineteenth century—The reaction—The socialistic scheme at variance with Christianity so far as it would circumscribe the sphere of liberty; so far as its advocates assail the Family; appeal only to materialistic and sordid considerations; insist upon the "class war"

—Socialism and the Church on different lines—The social ideal imperative—It involves essential characteristics of Christianity—Christians to be socialized—The social ideal to be translated into concrete actuality—Where the Church has failed in its trust—The Church's need of the democratic and social ideals .....*Pages* 59 to 75

CHAPTER VI

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP

Import of the contact between the Kingdom of God and democracy—It means for democracy influences of socialization—It means also influences of idealism: against a demeaning materialism; against pessimistic despair of democracy—The Kingdom means betterment; ideals to be realized—One's citizenship means obligation to be a factor in the formation of public opinion: against cynical disbelief in democracy; against government by wealth; on behalf of the majesty of law; on behalf of the unity of the people—The obligation of active effort—Need of consecration—Young men and politics—The quality of citizenship—The forces of devotion and enthusiasm to be rallied under the standard of self-sacrifice....*Pages* 76 to 93

CHAPTER VII

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD

The leaven works also in the world of industry—Socializing influences—Possibility of something more social than Socialism—Signs of closer association of capital and labor—Causes of grievance to be removed—Liability for accidents—Common law rules—Automatic compensation—More adequate legislation—Differing methods of compensation: compulsory insurance—Old age pensions .....*Pages* 94 to 108

CHAPTER VIII

INDUSTRIAL WAR OR PEACE

Into the industrial world the Kingdom of God imports influences of idealism—The social philosophy of materialism left behind—Upon all questions the Kingdom of God brings new light—In that light the democratic ideal transcends class antagonism—Profit sharing: its history and recent experiments therein—Opposition of labor organizations—How it may be met—The outlook for profit sharing—Its bearing upon the "class war"—Must class consciousness always mean war?—Mediation and arbitration—Something more than the economic side ..... *Pages* 109 to 122

CHAPTER IX

MOVING—WHITHER?

The Marxian interpretation of the social movement; disproved in essential particulars; and discredited—Syndicalism: aims theoretical and practical; prospects in America—Socialism to-day: attitude toward private property; classes of society; bureaucracy; freedom of the press; cost to personality—Present tendency toward a more organic reintegration of Society—Personality to have free play—Meaning of this for organized labor and for employers—Relations of interdependence—A social order transcending Socialism—The Kingdom coming—Promise in America. *Pages* 123 to 143

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND AMERICAN LIFE

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND AMERICAN LIFE

CHAPTER I

A CRITICAL PERIOD IN AMERICAN LIFE

No one can take a large look upon American life to-day without grave impressions of the view presented and some serious concern. It would seem not too much to say that we have come to a critical period in our national history. One's impressions of the time are in some respects not unlike what may have been the impressions made upon the minds of watchful observers by the years immediately preceding 1861. To few was it given to foresee the Civil War in its extent and duration and in all its cost of treasure and of blood. But it was evident to thoughtful minds that there was an impending crisis. To-day are not wanting signs that we are in the shadow of some impending

change. Politicians are sensible of it with a certain intuitive perception. It may be felt in the air. It confuses their observations and calculations. They have not known how to trim their sails or steer their course. Statesmen are deeply concerned by the situation. Upon business men this critical aspect of the present time forces itself. They are acting in the dark, in a situation which is impossible and which cannot continue. As to what is the wisest and best remedy they are not likely to find themselves in agreement; but they do agree in a conviction that some way out must be found, and that something is bound to happen as the outcome of present conditions. Students of social affairs cannot fail to read the signs of the times. But they will read with widely differing interpretations.

It is a critical period in the old and literal sense of that word, crisis, as meaning a deciding and determining. Perplexing and momentous questions confront us, questions regarding the purpose and functions of the several departments of government, the relations of the people to government and the judiciary, the principles of business, the relations of competition to combination and co-operation, the relations of government to business, the rights of

the individual and of corporations, questions touching not only the welfare but the very constitution and being of society. These questions not only demand the attention of legislators and executive officers and courts of justice, but vitally affect the interests of all who are doing business, and ultimately concern every citizen and member of the body politic. These questions with imperative pressure demand settlement. The situation is even more impressive as we turn from the political turmoil of the time to consider what of course cannot be considered wholly apart, social and industrial relations.

The momentous import of the Los Angeles confessions there is no room to doubt. There fell throughout the length and breadth of the land a pause, a hush, an interval of strained attention and expectation, a solemn awe. The hush was broken only by a very few strident and discordant voices. The public at large seemed to hold its breath. Labor was stunned. Evidently organized labor was facing a crisis. The hour of fate had struck. Sudden and unlooked for, it none the less was the moment of decision. There could be no prevarication or equivocation. It must be downright yes or no. It was the moment of stern demand, which was also great opportunity, opportunity to reconsider

methods and policies, at all events to disavow dynamite, repudiate wholesale assassination, and vindicate itself before the world. All this time the employing class was indulging in no exultant triumph. It was too much awed to yield to such temptation. It was no time for tactical maneuvers to secure strategic advantage. Rather was there a solemn lull in the storm of battle, something like a truce of God. There followed the Lawrence strike, with its unique episodes and its results affecting the textile industry of New England. There would seem to have been lawless outrages on the one side and the other. It is enough to note the emergence above the horizon of a black and threatening cloud and ominous mutterings of revolution and war. Then the coal strikes in Great Britain and America cannot fail to prove significant and fraught with result.

The present time has the character of a crisis in the sense of a turning point. We would seem to be on the edge of event. The air is full of expectation. Things are not likely to stay just as they are. The period looks big with import, pregnant with change. What is to be the issue? That who may foresee or foretell? A more practical question would be concerning our attitude and what on our part should be the first

step. It should be, I venture to think, the recognition that a solution of our problems requires that with the economic must work also ethical factors. This the very saving of our civilization demands. Already there has begun a reaction from materialism in thought, and almost a reaction from mere commercialism. Men are thinking more seriously, more deeply, on larger lines, with more intelligent appreciation of principles. There is needed, however, something more than intellect or taste. If the reaction from materialism be merely academic, æsthetic and dilettante, it will mean degeneracy and decadence. The tonic to save from that is to be found in moral qualities and moral effort. Moreover, for our particular and pressing problems, there is need of more and more of right and justice, sympathy, a sense of common humanity and brotherhood and the like moral principles.

Some thoughtful observers are beginning to question not only the rate but the direction of our progress, are beginning to ask whither we are moving, whether we may not really be going back instead of forward, whether after all there is any goal to move toward. It is pathetic to see slipping away and vanishing from men fond hopes, spun of deductions from physi-

cal science, that everything was making for progress. Sober thought is bringing the conviction that some of those generalizations have been too hasty and too optimistic. Most of us still cherish a faith in progress. Yet, on the other hand, there is insidious peril in the fatalistic optimism of the braggadocio who boasts, or the listless idler who, letting himself be lulled by complacent content, dreams of a manifest destiny, with no regard whatever to national shortcomings, derelictions, and delinquencies, or things that tend downward rather than upward. The health of the body politic depends on the health of its members. It is the quality of its citizenship that alone exalts a nation. Its citizens are not mere puppets, whether the power of progress be called cosmic force or the God of nations. Faith in the possibility of progress should be a spur and incentive to lend a hand and take hold to help it on. Things that are wrong do not right themselves. It is for men and women who believe in progress to devote study and effort to making things as they are more like things as they ought to be.

Too long men have been seeking the secret of progress in physical conditions and in the struggle for existence. We have got to learn the lesson that human progress lies not merely

or mainly on biological but on ethical and on spiritual, that is to say, personal lines. True progress demands that material things be made the means to the moral and spiritual. It demands, moreover, that there be uplift and widening beyond the individually personal into the larger and worthier interests that transcend.

We need not expect necessarily a sudden upheaval and cataclysm. Whatever revolutionary elements may be discerned in the present situation, there are still, as there have been since Karl Marx predicted the social revolution, counteracting causes and tendencies. Political revolutions have been found sometimes easy to achieve by men who could get hold of the requisite force. Changes, however, in the social life of a people cannot be so easily forced through. They are more likely to come through processes of evolution than through sudden and violent overturn of existing conditions. Changes may be none the less real and momentous without such revolutionary upheaval. The present time may well seem a crisis, because always there is some transition. Society cannot be stationary; for human life is essentially movement. It is always a becoming. Could we have a true view of it, it would be like a moving picture. Therefore we need not wonder at finding ourselves in

a period of transition. Whither we are moving and just what stages of progress are before us, are questions full of interest.

Meanwhile certain have had the vision of a city coming down out of heaven from God. They have received the promise of a divine goal of progress,

> "And one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

They have had the revelation of the Kingdom of God. They pray here and now that prayer: "Thy Kingdom come on earth." True progress requires, real progress here in America must include, the things of the Kingdom of God, righteousness, brotherhood, mutual helpfulness, the golden rule of service and of love. These things are not to be despised as sentimental or unpractical. They are needed for our practical problems. Said a great lawyer to me, the other day, a metropolitan lawyer of national fame: "To settle these vexing problems, there is needed love. Love is not only the solution, but the solvent. No more hate, but love!"

Nothing is really settled until it is settled right. The questions now pressing are to be settled finally in accordance with principles of eternal right and validity. The eternal God is not

to be left out of our account. Just now we may seem to be drifting aimlessly. But we are not drifting beyond the reach of God's care and outstretched arm of power. The times are surely moving toward the fulfillment of His august purposes; and God would have us, with our own intelligent and earnest effort, move toward the realization of His Kingdom and His righteousness.

CHAPTER II

A PRIMARY NEED OF AMERICAN LIFE

THAT stage of American history which was characterized by a national trait of boastfulness, the age of Jefferson Bricks and Elijah Pograms, of spread-eagle cant and colossal brag, is passing. Getting beyond a vociferously juvenile stage, this people is entering upon a maturer period of sober reflection and of national self-scrutiny with candid recognition and criticism. A good many things have concurred to put us upon thinking seriously. Such a period cannot fail to be wholesome and to be fraught with beneficent result.

To one who in this spirit of sober and searching examination studies American life to-day it can hardly fail to be evident that a primary need is the recovery of ideals and the reinstatement of standards. Some universal standards are necessary in order to see life steadily and see it whole. It were easy to demonstrate that a just appreciation of the value of life depends upon

standards whereby it is to be estimated. Our vaunted freedom of development and rapidity of progress have little significance or worth without some goals to aim for.

Certain standards and ideals which essentially belong to the Kingdom of God imperiously dominated the early colonists and were with some characteristic variations recognized, whether at Jamestown and Williamsburg, Plymouth and Boston, or Baltimore. Now, whatever part of our country be considered, it must be seen to be far otherwise. Not only is there to be observed a wide disregard of standards. There is to be feared a loss altogether of standards and ideals by many descendants of them who, persuaded thereof, were not disobedient to the vision. Here is a special task and high mission for men and women who seek the Kingdom of God and His righteousness; to labor for the recovery of certain ideals to their rightful authority over the lives of a loyal people.

It is worth while to remember, not only the high idealism manifested in our early colonial history and at the birth of the Nation, manifested again in the tragic and tremendous struggle to maintain its unity, but also the potential idealism of to-day. The native American may still be thrilled and possessed by enthusiasm,

however misdirected. Moreover, for multitudes to-day America is the very land of ideals. To many a downtrodden soul, wearied and worn by despotism, this is the land of promise, glorified by ideals of liberty, of justice, of happiness for all. It is pathetic to think of the idealism, howsoever vaguely apprehended, of many an one who lands on these shores.* It has been, however dimly discerned, the light that has lured these strangers from afar and led them hither. Notwithstanding all our rampant and rapacious materialism, yet in view of our high traditions, of the idealism of former generations and the inarticulate hopes and yearnings of many newcomers in our midst, it surely ought to be no hopeless task to recall the people of such a land to loyal recognition of certain ideals.

Already many cherish the idea of America as the land of opportunity. Too often, however, the only conception is the widening of opportunity for a selfish individualism. The outcome of that we have discovered in the evils of relentless competition. What is needed is increasing recognition of America as the land of

* When the above was written I had not seen the articles in the *Atlantic Monthly* for 1912, by Mary Antin, since published by Houghton Mifflin Company under the title: "The Promised Land." Here is revealed how much of idealism there may be in the soul of a little Jewish immigrant from Russia.

opportunity for humanity in a very large and lofty sense. It is not the mere opportunity of material prosperity, of getting gain and exploiting others less fortunate. Let the worth of America be rated in spiritual terms. It ought to stand for humanity in the truest sense, for

"The mighty truths that make us men."

It is the land of opportunity for the demonstration, on a scale unprecedented, of equal and exact justice to all, of civic, political, and social righteousness.

A prime responsibility in a democratic commonwealth is the responsibility of the ballot. It behooves a democracy jealously to maintain the ideal honor of the ballot and dignity of the voter, never to be degraded by purchase or insulted by such suggestion. A man who has occupied important political positions avowed and defended, I believe, his purchase of votes somewhat on this wise: "Certainly I have bought votes, and it was a good use of the money. A man is going to vote wrong. I induce him to vote right. He is better off by five dollars, and the country is better off to the extent of his vote." It is a kind of patriotic effort which reminds one of Montaigne's defence of necessary offices, pertaining to government, which are not

only vile but vicious, excusable because they are of use, and "that the common necessity covers their true qualities." Such offices, however, Montaigne suggests, may be left to citizens most robust and least squeamish, "who sacrifice their honor and conscience as others of old sacrificed their lives for the good of their country." * In this regard good is, I think, likely to accrue from the prominence of the question touching Woman Suffrage. While both its advocates and opponents may exaggerate the results to be expected from the ballot in and by itself, yet a wholesome outcome of the agitation may be a new estimate of the due dignity of what many women so ardently desire.

Again, there is the ideal of a courageous citizenship, whether in or out of public office. This is most necessary in a democracy, and is there especially hard to maintain because of peculiar temptations to cowardly compliance and ignoble dependence. We want voters who will shake themselves free from sloth and from servitude. For office we want men who want for themselves nothing but the approval of their own conscience. Let brave independence be more and more valued among us, that we may have officials and lawmakers not wearing the

* Essay: "Of Profit and Honesty."

tag and collar of interests that own them, and a body of voters not slaves to party tyranny, that so this may be in very truth a free Republic!

A need of this nation to-day is a renewed ideal of loyalty. Some of us may recall from the days of '61 the frequent use of the adjective "loyal." It meant something in those stirring days. How much does it mean to most of our people to-day? The result of the Civil War and general acquiescence therein would naturally tend to weaken the sectional spirit that in former days so fiercely manifested itself in loyalty to one's own State. But, while that has been diminished, it is a question whether there has been a corresponding increase in national loyalty. A sense of our lack in this regard was forced upon many who thought upon the spirit of intense patriotism which animated the Japanese in their war with Russia. Doubtless any peril to our national existence would again elicit loyalty. But, as things are, there is only a languid spirit of patriotism, and a proportionate loss in our national life.

This may be largely accounted for by the very vastness of our land and by the increased concentration of power in the Federal government, which tend to make the idea of the nation seem

somewhat remote from the personal concerns of the individual. The statutes of his State touch him closely. But the Federal authority, while recognized as irresistible, is not felt in any near or direct contact with his actual daily life. Insensibly the larger loyalty recedes into the vague distance and the small loyalties, for example, to sect, or party, or class, usurp the place of a genuine and potent patriotism. How far this may go is evinced by the recent reported utterance of a labor leader at Cooper Union: "Better be a traitor to your country than a traitor to your class." Now membership in a labor-union need not be, and surely ought not to be, at all incompatible with loyal citizenship in the United States of America. In that treasonable utterance, however, the small loyalty was distinctly placed in hostility to the larger loyalty.

We cannot afford to lose that ideal of a large patriotism. Well may we begin with the children. Much may be expected from training in the public schools, the custom of saluting the flag and the teaching of national history, with direct appeals to the youthful imagination and persistent inculcation of an enthusiasm for this our country. Here should be recognition of the personal element in loyalty. Much should be

made of the stories of our national heroes. Also their statues, looking down upon our public places, might have upon young and old an educational, a stirring and inspiring influence.

A Presidential election might seem a golden opportunity for advancing a lofty patriotism. Such it would be but for the temptation it brings to a heated partisanship, which after all means a lesser loyalty rather than the genuine patriotism consisting in loyalty to the country as a whole. Better than story and statue is the living man. In the person of the President of the United States there ought to be a stimulus for that personal quality of loyalty that in other lands attaches itself to kings and queens. In this respect there ought to be found a consideration to alleviate the regret some are disposed to feel at the journeyings often which have seemed to make the Presidency peripatetic. How much it might mean for the people in different sections of the land with their own eyes to see one President's dynamic facial expression and another's genial smile, to hear the voice and press the hand of the man who in himself embodies the executive sovereignty of this free people. Here again, however, too often the name of him who occupies the White House elicits only the enthusiasm or the hatred of partisan

loyalty. In this connection it were devoutly to be wished that a President might bear himself less as the leader of a party, more as the acknowledged head of this whole people.

It is not enough to brag of the bigness of the nation. It is necessary to come from the vastly vague to something definite and concrete that shall touch the man of the people personally. His loyalty to his labor-union or club is only partial and sometimes, as we have seen, antagonistic to the whole. What is wanted is a relationship which shall afford training in public spirit. Have we not in the lesser political units, town or city and State, a field for the culture of loyalty to the whole community or commonwealth, so that through the lesser loyalties our people may come into a leal and loyal love of the whole country? In the prevalent imperialistic kind of nationalism Professor Royce finds a type of social consciousness which Hegel, referring to the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, described as "estranged from itself." It is too vast to know itself or to engage personal interest. In a thoughtful passage the Harvard professor pleads for a new provincialism, which he sees already manifested, for example, in the cherishing of State universities, in efforts for bettering and beautifying cities, in parks and

museums and libraries, and in village improvement societies.*

In all instances of civic spirit and communal pride there is wholesome manifestation of the feeling of social unity. Only in this regard I should want to emphasize the importance of keeping that local public spirit in some relations to the nation always beheld beyond village or city or State, all seen in a true perspective that shall with pride recognize community and commonwealth as American and regard one's efforts on their behalf as his contribution toward the enrichment and elevation of American life. Such wholesome provincialism would be surely ministrant to a true patriotism. Above all, there ought to be a reasonable idealism, by which I mean an intelligent appreciation of what this country stands for in a way no part thereof can; of the import, the possibilities of value, not only to me and mine to-day, but to mankind from generation to generation, in what we may imply when we say "America."

Loyalty involves reverence for law. This country needs to-day to recover an ideal of the majestic dignity of law. That ideal we may recognize at the founding of this nation. It has of late suffered by observation of the law's delay.

* "The Philosophy of Loyalty," pp. 238–248.

This may be remedied by reform of methods of procedure. The ideal has suffered also through a more and more pronounced attitude of criticism toward the courts of justice. Certain recent decisions have been disappointing. Judicial decisions ought to rest upon a conception of law not as static and unalterably rigid but as vital. Law should render to the body politic the service of a living organ, not impose the bondage of a dead letter. Laws must change as the moral principles of society advance and the standards of righteousness move forward. The interpretation of laws as applied to life must keep pace with life in its changing social conditions and enlarged and quickened convictions of right. Then the laws will express the highest will of the community.

A distinction, however, may be drawn between laws and law, between the statutes as interpreted and applied, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the ideal authority of law, as ultimate. In regard to the relation of courts of justice to the popular will, and the popular recall of judges or their decisions, the question is not whether to trust government by the people. So to put the question is to twist it unfairly and confuse the issue. The question is whether popular government will bear to put

upon itself some restraint and secure to itself the dignity of reverence and self-control. The well-being and stability of democracy require that checks should be provided to make its course sometimes slow and to prevent the people from always doing at once just what they please.

Such beneficent tribunals of democracy, to guard against partisan excess and the tyranny of majorities, ought to be our Federal and State courts. Their high office it is to guard from momentary impulse or passion, to secure adherence to principles, and be the bulwarks to conserve liberty through law. They are the ultimate defence of freedom from itself. They must not be directly or indirectly subjected to the will of the people. Their dignity and independence must be reverentially upheld, in order to secure to popular government that sober self-restraint which has been a chief element in the strength of the Anglo-Saxon democracies.

There must be not only civic and national but also domestic loyalty. America has urgent need to-day to recover the ideal of the sacredness of the Family, an institution as divine as the Church of God. It is not necessary to tell how insidiously this institution is to-day assailed in the name of individual liberty and of social

reform; how it is threatened by the facility of divorce; and how wantonly in many flagrant instances the American home has been wrecked by the self-indulgence and the self-will that have defied the binding sanctity of the bonds of marriage, until in these regards our land is a by-word for shame among the nations of the earth.

The import of the Family to our social and national life it is impossible to overstate. Think what family life may mean for the children of the land. Weakened as are its ties, and dishonored as its authority often is to-day, the family yet supplies the sole redeeming influence for many a life, that is only so uplifted from ignoble sordidness, mean selfishness and brutal degradation, and bound in saving relations to other lives. Where should we be without it? Society and the nation cannot afford to let this institution go. In the fight that is on to maintain it, almost everything to be valued is at stake. It is time loyally to stand for the indissoluble integrity of marriage and the home it creates. Parents, teachers, and all who have influence ought solicitously to impress upon young men and young women a solemn sense of the sacredness of matrimony, as an estate to be entered into only with serious and reverent consideration. Theirs it is diligently to labor for the re-

covery of standards of unselfishness, of sober restraint, of self-denial, of loyalty, of reverence, which alone can preserve the Family as the social unit for coming generations of men.

Another ideal ignored in this land to a degree disgraceful to a civilized nation is the sacred value of human life. Contempt for life is manifested in the terrible frequency of homicide and in the appalling rate of infant mortality with which we have hardly begun to deal. In some States the value of a life is legally fixed at the maximum of a paltry five or ten thousand dollars. Recently, when an aviator, on account of the condition of his machine, hesitated to make an ascent, the crowd with angry clamor insisted that he should go up, until yielding to their taunts he did so and perished. It was an instance of disregard of life that makes one recall the fierce brutality of the spectators of a Roman arena.

At last our eyes are opened to the fact that great steamship companies, while making so much of luxury and of speed, have had as the very last consideration the safety of human life. But the fact is not so exceptional as at first it seems. Mr. John Mitchell has not long since in earnest protest called attention to the prepon-

derant proportion of fatal accidents to our workingmen. Surely he is not the only one who has felt the cruel shame of this awful waste of human life. It is yet too soon to have forgotten the holocausts of working women in Newark and New York. Is it too much to ask that factories where people work all day should be as safe as theatres where they go in the evening for amusement? Then also let us hope we may never again have to shudder at wholesale assassination by dynamite.

In his New Year's Eve musings Charles Lamb confesses he is in love not only with rural solitudes but also with "the sweet security of streets." That in our cities to-day is a thing of the past. It is not long since I have lost three personal friends who were at different times the victims of reckless drivers of automobiles. It is quite true that the great majority of those who travel by motor-cars show consideration and humanity. There are, however, enough exceptions to constitute a public peril. That our common crowded thoroughfares should be converted into rapid-transit tracks at the whim and for the pleasure of a special few is a thing that ought not to be tolerated by communities claiming to be civilized. The paramount aim of law should be to secure the safety of human life as

it is not secured in certain of our States today.

The ideal value of each and every human life, estimated in accordance with those standards of value that may claim the sanctions of the Kingdom of God, may be seen to be no other than what we may call the democratic ideal. This ideal we shall have occasion to deal with more specifically. It is perhaps enough now to remark that it may be traced, as we may later see, to the Kingdom of God. It has behind it the potency of that Kingdom, and is pushed to the fore as more and more that Kingdom comes.

This ideal touches the people of this day and land at many points. Truly conceived of, the democratic ideal involves far more than questions of the right of suffrage or the right of personal liberty. It touches the inner possibilities of human nature and the realization of those possibilities under any and every outward condition. It involves the question of the essential content and meaning of human life. The twentieth century may have its chief characteristic in the struggle likely to prove necessary to demonstrate and maintain the genuine significance of life and to preserve the spiritual content and worth wherewith it is invested by the revelation

and sanctions of the Kingdom of God. All our material progress is only the scaffolding for the slow upbuilding in genuine realization of that spiritual ideal.

CHAPTER III

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE CHURCH

A PRIMARY need of American life we have seen is a recovery of ideals, or perhaps we might rather say, a spirit more given to idealize the relations of life. This need is strikingly manifest if we consider life, as we are more and more forced to consider it, in its collective or social aspect. As man deals with man, as class confronts class, there is need of something more than economic laws of supply and demand, of work and wages. On both sides there is need of the larger conceptions and the more generous ideas, the farther horizon of imagination and sympathy, that a high idealism alone can give.

Now, is there something which is fraught with the idealism that this country needs? I think there is. What this country needs is the idealism of the Kingdom of God. There is the supreme ideal that includes all others. It sums

up the ideals we have reviewed: the dignity of citizenship, a genuine loyalty, the majesty of law, the sacredness of the family, the value of human life, the significance of life. These and the other ideals which we may find are needed in American life are bound up with, are involved in, and consecrated by the Kingdom of God. When we use that phrase, what do we mean? Will the record of His revelation help us to answer the question: What is the Kingdom of God?

That precise phrase is not found in the Old Testament. The idea, however, of a divine Kingdom may be traced through all that history and literature. Howsoever at times narrowed the conception had been, and although it had been emptied of ethical and spiritual meaning to many minds, while others were looking in devout yearning and expectation; yet it was a proclamation to thrill all hearts when that voice in the wilderness cried: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." A notion familiar as current coin Christ stamped anew with His own superscription. It was the master-thought of His teaching from the time when He came into Galilee, "preaching the gospel of God and saying, the time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand." His gospel was the good news of the

Kingdom.* In His teaching the phrase is many-sided, with now one and now another meaning prominent.

The primary meaning of the phrase is the reign of God, as for example in the model prayer. Again it seems to refer to the realm of God, the great inclusive company under God's rule, as when Christ speaks of "the least in the kingdom of God." Again it means certain blessed privileges of those who are under the divine rule, as when it is declared to be the possession of the poor in spirit. Lastly, it sometimes refers to the future destiny of such persons, a time of triumphant culmination "in the kingdom of heaven." Always, however, an essential element is the conception of human life ruled by God's Will.

When Christ had come this Kingdom was a fact, "in your midst," because there was One among them who in Himself illustrated and embodied the new type of life. At the same time it was an ideal, to be in increasing measure realized as men should come under that divine rule. He taught men to pray "Thy kingdom come." There was to be, moreover, an ultimate consummation "in the kingdom of heaven."

* St. Matthew iv. 23.

This teaching His apostles continued. St. Paul, for example, abode two whole years in Rome "preaching the kingdom of God." More and more, however, the practical interests of their task impressed upon them the importance of corporate expression, of embodiment in a society. Such a society Christ had founded. His followers, carrying on His work, found their attention inevitably more and more occupied with the institution which embodied the idea, the Church which was His Body to do His work in the world, while the conception of the Kingdom of heaven receded into the background as a consummation to be expected in the world to come. Thus we have the institutional aspect of the Kingdom as the Church. This aspect was emphasized by St. Augustine. He, so far as we have record, was the first writer who expressly identified the Church with the Kingdom of God. This identification, to be traced to St. Augustine, was exaggerated in the Middle Age. It lingers on in the minds of many Christians to-day who mean the Church when they think of God's Kingdom. While such identification cannot be maintained in the light of Holy Scripture and of history, yet there is a close relation between the two. If not the Kingdom of God, the Church is the Kingdom

of Christ; and the two shall be one in that consummation and "end" when the Church as His Kingdom Christ shall deliver up to God even the Father, that God may be all in all. Meanwhile, as the society founded by Him whose gospel was the good news of the Kingdom of God, and as His Body, the Church is an expression, an embodiment, a setting forth in copy, of transcending realities of that Kingdom, a preparatory means to its triumphant consummation. It is a manifestation of the Kingdom of God in the making. Nay, more. The Church is the chief instrument, the divinely accredited agent and ministerial representative of that Kingdom.

At the same time the Kingdom of God is not fully expressed by the Church nor confined to its limits. It is of larger dimensions. It means all of human life so far as brought under divine ordering. The Kingdom comes, more and more, as God's will is done on earth. That next petition thus explains the Kingdom. The model prayer intimates also its scope, and moreover the outline and order of its programme. God's will to be done, our daily bread, forgiveness by God and man of trespasses against them, the divine leading amidst the temptations and trials of life, and deliverance from the evil. It puts

before forgiveness, and deliverance from the evil, daily bread. For it is co-extensive with the whole of human life. Man does not live by bread alone; but bread is a prime necessity of man's life. First that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual. Including all the relations of human life, while its chief organ is the Church, that Kingdom touches and lays hold of, and embraces in its scope other institutions, the Family, the State, and all the forms through which man's social life finds expression. It claims all his life for its domain. It means a social order as wide as human existence. It touches the science of sociology, and into its problems brings new factors: God's will, His righteousness to settle things right, His love to move men of good will.

The individualistic democracy of a former age, with its negative principle of *laissez-faire* and "hands-off," its exaltation of abstract doctrines of individual right, its premium upon bare selfishness and greed, its theoretical equality and practical inequalities, its complacent optimism blind to evils, is outgrown. In recoil from its results men are turning to seek with earnestness of conviction and purpose a fairer and fuller, a juster and richer social order, the

charter whereof is to be found, whether men know it or not, in the Kingdom of God. That enthusiasm of humanity, that was enkindled and has set many hearts on fire within the Church, has recently been spreading far and wide beyond its bounds. To-day outside the Church are ministrant to the cause of humanity great agencies of education, of charity, of civic reform, of social amelioration.

Meanwhile the Church has been often short-sighted to discern and inert to grasp opportunity. For a time it was too much taken up with escaping from the evil of the world to make its life effectively tell upon the world. Later it was bewildered and confused. Its wiser course would be not to endeavor to compete but to keep in touch and in relations of co-operation with those other and newer instrumentalities of service. For example, it will be better all around when the Church is no longer regarded by multitudes as the bestower of alms and doles, when the organization of charity shall have committed the responsibility of poor-relief to other agencies and the Church shall largely employ those agencies. The Church may well recognize and co-operate with those other agencies and instruments of the Kingdom of God, and at the same time should be con-

vinced and sure of its own office and mission.

The Church still remains the most direct embodiment of the social ideal of the Kingdom of God. Its sphere is larger than that of the Family or the State. The authority of the Family is for the early years of life. The authority of the State is concerned with certain political and civic relations and outward acts. The various agencies of betterment are special in purpose and of particular application. The Church, being independent of domestic or political, of national or racial relations, is as wide-reaching as humanity. Its catholic mission is to all men. Its catholic faith, in its contents, appeals to all of each man. With its great sacraments of a birth and of a Death it embraces in its hallowing scope the entire compass of human existence. Its reach is not only more extensive than those other agencies, but also more intensive, penetrating far within. All of life, touched by the sacraments, is touched to finer issues, in order that the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, may be sanctified.

Thus the Church may well claim a certain leadership on behalf of the Kingdom of God. The Christian Church in any age ought to be the embodied conscience of the time. Its high

office is to call the age to the vision of the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. It is to proclaim the law of the Kingdom as found in its rule of prayer: God's will to be done on earth; not my Father, my bread, but our Father, our daily bread. It is to hold up the ideals and standards of the Kingdom of God, ideals of right and justice, of sympathy and helpfulness; to bear witness to the dignity of labor, the responsibilities in the stewardship of wealth and advantage and opportunity, the responsibility of the employer, the responsibility of the shareholder, the responsibility of the consumer in demanding or taking advantage of a cheapness incompatible with a fair wage to the workers or proper conditions of working; to make unflinching protest against specific unrighteousness and injustice, against the sins of covetousness, of cruel and relentless greed of gain, of idleness and sloth on the part of rich or poor, and of all selfish luxury.

Above all, the Church ought to bear witness to, and in itself illustrate, the social constitution of the Kingdom. At the first, Christian brotherhood was so much of a principle and a passion as to make the early Church almost like a secret society. It would be a long, eventful story to tell how that unique unity of "the

brotherhood that is in the world" * came to be overlaid with imperial and feudal characteristics and in the course of time to be broken. It is enough now to say that a prime and pressing duty of the Church to-day is to recover its original character as the catholic brotherhood. To this principle of brotherhood the Church cannot help bearing a certain witness, because its essential constitution transcends all distinctions of class, caste, race, or color. Its great sacraments are signs and seals of brotherhood, of birth into one household, of fellowship at one Father's table. This inevitable witness in ideal the Church is by all means to make actual, positive, and inclusive.

The Church is not only to be for any age the prophetic voice of conscience, it is to be moreover a positive force therein. Its catholic mission has been obscured by considering the Church from a negative standpoint. The New Testament word for the Church is often regarded as by derivation meaning those called out from the world in separation therefrom, whereas its origin was in the calling out of citizens to the common assembly. More than once in its history the Church has been tempted to forget its catholic mission to the world in a

* I Peter, v. 9 (literal translation).

fanatical exaggeration of unworldliness, in anxiety rather to escape from the corruption of the world than to be the salt to save it from corruption. Had this overstrained spirituality secured the ascendency, the Church must have become a pietistic sect amidst the world, and would not have been an aggressive power on the world, conquering and to conquer. The Church of Christ was to be no narrow conventicle of the select. The Church is the city and commonwealth of God. Therein is an immeasurable amount of latent spiritual force. It is for the Church to contribute to the world of to-day social energy and inspire all agencies of uplift and amelioration with spiritual power.

The Church is to manifest and convey that Pentecostal trust, the power of the Spirit. Entrusted with that mighty power, the Church cannot, without being false to its mission and disloyal to its Head, remain negatively inert and passive, is bound in the Spirit to be a positive, aggressive, militant, invasive, conquering, dynamic force upon the world. Thus the Church is to interpret human life in the light of the Kingdom of God and also to bring the power of the Spirit to reinforce the life of the children of men. The Church cannot be indifferent to questions touching righteousness between man

and men and human weal and woe. So long as one little child is condemned by human greed to hard and crushing labor, it is for the Church to cry aloud in protest until it is made impossible for such a thing to be. If one poor girl is trapped and held a slave, the Church ought to quicken the consciences of men to see to it that the resources of civilization are taxed to their utmost to rescue her and secure the protection of others. "Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." The Church is for man. In seeking the glory of God must not be forgotten the service of man. Problems pressing to-day have the human touch which gives them ethical import and a gravity which makes them ultimately religious questions. Where the Church stands ought always to be not far from the Kingdom of God. It is for the Church to give this age, not the petrified Christianity of a time long past, not mere models of the machinery of organization, but living leadership in eternal principles.

The preceding chapter brought us to the need in this time to demonstrate and maintain the significance and worth of human life. If this be so, it is the open door of vast and inviting opportunity before the Christian Church in so far

as the Church is the authorized representative and efficient agent of the Kingdom of God. The potential value of each and every human life is something not altogether unfamiliar to the masses of mankind. In the midst of the toil and turmoil of their daily existence they vaguely apprehend and greet afar with a passionate yearning the thought of the possibilities of life. But they see only as in a glass darkly or in the dim distance far away. Now to interpret human life in the revealing and transfiguring light of the Kingdom of God, to demonstrate its value according to the standards of weight and measure in that Kingdom, to unfold to the view of faith the possibilities of life to be realized in the Kingdom of God, to sound the trumpet-call of summons to arise and enter into this choice heritage of humanity and realize these possibilities, and not only to bid men arise but to take them by the hand and lift them up and on, is the mission and task of the Church of Christ.

It is a mission not unworthy even of the august history and the priceless equipment of the Society founded by Him who called Himself Son of man and laid hold of the nature of all men. It is a mission that is indeed wide-reaching in its scope. For it deals not with individuals alone. Ideals of the Kingdom of God

that make their insistent appeal to-day as never before lie in the possibilities inherent in collective humanity. The reintegration of society in a real brotherhood of man, the realization of finer industrial relations, the attainment of a true industrial and social democracy, the education of the masses of men in a truly noble patriotism, the assimilation and welding together of these incoming folk of all nations and kindreds and tongues, and their training into a genuine citizenship which shall receive consecration and inspiration from their citizenship in a better country, that is, an heavenly—all this is within the meaning of the Kingdom of God in America and involves tasks wherein the Church plainly is to have some part as the agency and instrument of that Kingdom.

Always will be needed the Church's witness and inspiration, needed for this very reason that the Church represents the Kingdom of God. The cause of humanity goes forward in divers directions of economic and social and political betterment. Yet always for further progress there is need of some ideal which the Church is the agency to furnish, because the Church is to express and voice, proclaim and illustrate the ideals of the Kingdom of God. The Church stands for ideals that are ever beyond, ever

beckoning on to further realization, inasmuch as they are the ideals of a Kingdom that is not of this world. They belong to a sphere that is above time. In its interpretation of life the Church regards not only things seen and temporal. Its outlook is on and up toward that which is beyond, the unseen and eternal. Not yet has man entered into his dominion. We see not yet all things in subjection to him. Still the Church's face is forward. Still its prayer must be: "Thy Kingdom *come!*"

CHAPTER IV

THE DEMOCRATIC IDEAL AND THE CHURCH

EVERYBODY knows the definition of Democracy in those immortal words of Lincoln at Gettysburg, words for which he was indebted to the Boston preacher, Theodore Parker, who, in language that may be traced back beyond him, had spoken of government "over all the people, by all the people, for all the people." This is Democracy. There is, however, here involved something more than a transfer of power from the crown to the crowd. There is what we may call the democratic ideal. Beyond democratic methods of government is an ideal regarding human nature. That ideal may be described as the recognition of the average man, without regard to length of lineage or purse, not in virtue of any power, position, or possessions, the recognition of his worth as man and of the possibility that this inherent worth may in actual fact be realized. That ideal appears invested with a divine authority as we recognize

God in the onward movement of history. Toward the progress of that ideal unique service was rendered by the epoch-making philosopher of Königsberg. Kant turned attention from intellectual processes and endowments, which are exceptional and distinctive of the comparatively few, to that imperative sense of right and duty which is not confined to the few but is a universal possession of human nature. That the essential principle of worth lies not in knowledge but in will is democratic doctrine.

The democratic ideal itself the world owes to Jesus Christ. It is really a cardinal Christian principle. It is involved in the central fact that the Son of God became Son of Man with men; and into the gospel as a whole is inwrought a conception of the value and possibilities of human nature. The democratic ideal may be defined as the recognition of the personality in all sorts and conditions of men. As such it belongs essentially to the gospel. With the doctrines, hopes, and purposes of any Christianity that in aim and spirit transcends the limits of a mere sect is wrapped up this democratic ideal. Its security depends largely upon the true and faithful witness of the Christian Church.

The democratic ideal might have seemed triumphant in France less than four generations

ago. But almost immediately it was trodden down by one after another tyranny. The outlook for Democracy to-day is not what it might antecedently have been supposed to be. The horizon is not free from threatening clouds. Before now the world has seen the outward forms of republican institutions kept on, unchanged, to cloak the fact of despotism, and may have the spectacle again. For their true life, the institutions of Democracy depend upon its ideal, and that depends, more than most men imagine, upon Christianity. If that ideal is to be preserved inviolate for future generations, there will be required ampler recognition and fulfillment of the democracy inherent in Christianity. The Church has a positive witness to bear to the worth and for the complete realization of the personality and the personal life in all sorts and conditions of men.

The democratic ideal is menaced in America to-day by various influences and tendencies, for example, indirectly by the lowering of standards and directly by influences that may be described as plutocratic. In the first place, then, the Church's witness will consist in the upholding of high standards. With Democracy goes a tendency to lower standards quite naturally where

everybody's judgment is presumed to be of equal value. To almost everybody one thing appeals, money. Thus commercialism comes largely to dominate the life of the people. Wealth accumulates and arrogates to itself power. Democracy may safely coexist with aristocracy, where, as in England, it is largely an aristocracy historically bound to serve the State and the public weal. As a matter of fact, in England the body politic is more truly democratic and more sensitive to the popular will than in America. There is a measure of truth even in the paradox of Mr. Price Collier that the House of Lords "is the most democratic institution in England." * It is, one may venture to think, even now, and when all is said, in as close touch with the people at large as is the United States Senate. While thus entirely compatible with a genuine aristocracy of service, the democratic ideal is imperilled by a plutocracy which, in the second and third generations, is tempted to assume an emancipation from service. That temptation in America is so insidious and so strong that, although there are not a few noteworthy instances to the contrary, the plutocrat by inheritance is not so likely to be living for the community as to be living off the community. Against pluto-

* "England and the English," p. 61.

cratic influences of to-day the Church must faithfully hold up higher standards; must set its face sternly against the vulgarity that means a lack of standards, and that manifests itself in seeking only gain or in devotion to the sole pursuit of pleasure or in flaunting the luxuries and extravagancies of wealth; must persistently endeavor to win men and women to that simplicity wherein lies the true dignity of life and to that purpose of service wherein lies life's value.

The Church may well beware of maintaining such relations with the power of wealth as to be considered or called an organ of capital. The clergy will by no means engage in the wicked work of exciting class against class. But they will take good care that they do not even seem to be retained in the interest of any privileged class. There are subtle dangers here. In America, for example, there is danger both for the Church and for Democracy in the fact that, while Church influences control almost all the leading schools for boys, the prices at those schools are so high as practically to be well-nigh prohibitory for any but the sons of the rich, and there results in large degree the training up of a wealthy class by itself.

Especially has the Church a prophetic mission to witness to righteousness. The immediate

success of a democratic civilization is, for obvious reasons, more likely to be on material lines and to touch the comfort and luxury of the physical accessories of life. There is not the assurance of equal development in taste and intellectual culture. For such a civilization the salt to save from corruption must lie in moral qualities, and the tonic to save from degeneracy in moral endeavor. Inestimable service, then, toward keeping society sound and wholesome is rendered when the Church faithfully proclaims the righteousness that exalts a nation. It is a needed office to show the personal factors entering into economic problems and to state those problems in ethical terms. The Christian Church ought to be the prophetic voice and, as we have seen, the embodied conscience of the time. Its witness is to be borne against commercial dishonesty. The business corporation is practically a new kind of individuality. Corporate Christianity may not rightly ignore the conduct and character of corporate associations of men. It ought to show how men share in responsibilities as well as profits; to bring, as it were, an X-ray to penetrate the tissue of the soulless corporation and reveal personal responsibility for flagrant wrong which is not less wrong when men are confederate against right. One corpo-

ration ought always and unmistakably to be on the side of right, and that is the corporation of Jesus Christ.

The witness to righteousness is to be borne against plutocratic corruption. There is sinister suggestiveness in the reasons given for his taking office by Lorenzo de' Medici, "Lorenzo the Magnificent." "I accepted against my will and only for the sake of protecting my friends and our own fortunes, for in Florence one can ill live in the possession of wealth without control of the government." It was not the last successful attempt by interests of a certain kind to gain control in politics. Stern witness is to be borne against the temptation in democracies to use public power for private gain, against corrupt political methods, the purchase of votes and the sale of law, against prostitution of the trust of office, against the tyranny of a cabal or a boss, against any perversion of what should be a government of laws not of men. Standing for the authority of divine law over all human affairs, the Church ought to be indeed a bulwark for the cause of men. There is need to hold up the highest standards and ideals of citizenship. There are indications of a considerable enlargement of the functions of government. If it shall be so, only of the more import becomes the

righteous administration of government and the more important, behind it, an intelligent and righteous public opinion. The Church cannot afford to ignore what is implied in the fact of a government that is to be the exponent of all the enlightenment and of all the virtue of a people.

In particular there should be faithful witness against that apathetic supineness, often attendant upon Democracy, which results in the withdrawal, from the burden and heat of civil life, of certain men who owe their country service. That service, it is true, would be likely to involve some cost, not of money, but of pride, a cost larger in America than in England, where a man may suffer defeat and still gain somewhere else a seat in Parliament. Such cost, however, ought not to weigh against plain duty. Genuine civilization demands the discharge of duty by the *civis,* the citizen, the man in society. That is a fine passage in a letter of St. Augustine where, after referring to Plato's Republic, he uses the language: "There is no limit either in measure or in time to the claims which their country has upon the care and service of right-hearted men," and presently writes: "Now the churches which are multiplying throughout the world are, as it were, sacred seminaries of pub-

lic instruction, in which this sound morality is inculcated and learned." * The Church to-day must not be wanting in the inculcation of civic duty and public righteousness.

That temptation to withdraw from contact with the world assails the Church itself now as always. But to-day there is peculiar necessity that the Church come close with potent touch. Our age is turning from dialectics to dynamics. There is need of guidance and inspiration in a spirit of power. There may well be question whether, in dealing with matters of practical ethics and social right and wrong, the Church is not showing a lack of power and has not need to pray and strive for the spirit of counsel and ghostly strength.

It is, I trust, evident that nothing like a baleful connection with the State is necessarily implied in the office of the Church, from its high standpoint, to inspire, to elevate, and to interpret the democratic State. The Church ought to bear witness to-day, as did St. Paul under the Empire, to the majesty of the civil authority. Because, in a democratic society, humanity collectively in the commonwealth governs itself; none the less, rather all the more, is government to-day, as of old it was declared to be, the min-

* *Ep.* XCI. 3.

ister of God whose image humanity bears. Secular in its outward form it may be, yet in reality the State upholds great spiritual forces without which society cannot be maintained, and itself rests upon everlasting moral foundations. Its authority and life are invested with a dignity of purpose which is more than human and essentially belongs to that law whose seat is the bosom of God.

It is impossible worthily to deal with Democracy by undemocratic methods. It behooves the Church in its own government and administration to exemplify the democratic principle which belongs to its best traditions. That principle has been in a former time too much overlaid by methods that were autocratic and aristocratic. It was quite in keeping with such tendencies for the bishop to dwell apart from the people, sometimes as it is unto this day at Wells, where may be seen the walls about the palace with moat and drawbridge of the fourteenth century.

There is to-day new recognition of the democratic principle, and nowhere more freely than in England. At the last Lambeth Conference, English bishops expressed plainly their conviction that the Church ought to show a readiness

to set its own house in order, and "to model its own system of government on a sound representative and democratic basis." There was adopted by the Conference a resolution that "The ministry of the laity requires to be more widely recognized, side by side with the ministry of the clergy, in the work, the administration, and the discipline of the Church." First in the Anglican Communion to provide for an equal representation of the laity was the American Episcopal Church. There is, however, room for question whether, in its councils and on its parish vestries, the actual representation of laymen is sufficiently democratic. Recently Mr. John Burns, in conversation with the writer, pointed with pride to the Labor members of Parliament and to himself in the Cabinet, and said: "In America you have not a single Labor member of Congress." The councils of the Church might be open to a like criticism.

The Church should be true to the democratic ideal in ministration. It ought to be now as it was when the Lord confidently appealed to the fact that the poor had the gospel preached to them. We may well ask if it is so now, and, if not, why not? How, then, is the Church fulfilling this mission to proclaim good news to the

poor? Some of us may wonder whether the majority of our well-to-do people have not yet to be waked up to be aware of any such mission. It is undeniable that the Church of Him who died for all is not to-day by any means reaching all. It is certainly true that the Church of Him who worked at the carpenter's trade ought to come nearer than it does to the multitudes who work with their hands to-day.

That the Church does much for the poor is not enough. Recently has been raised the pertinent question whether much that has been given to the poor has not been a positive hindrance to the Church's real work, which is to preach the gospel to them. To preach to the poor, moreover, as brothers of the rich, is necessary, not only to save souls but to save society. There are churches where the rich and the poor meet together and together worship Him who is the maker of them all. There ought to be many more such churches than there are. It is a reproach to a congregation even to seem in the least like a club of prosperous and congenial people, to which others, less well-to-do, may not aspire to belong except in the position of pensioners. The Church is for men, whether rich or poor. With a mission to all sorts and conditions

of men, it is not as it should be when certain sorts and conditions of men are in large part not receiving its ministrations.

It is time to ask whether there should not be often used very simple and flexible services, adapted to the people to be reached, and also whether the character of the music should not be such as to encourage congregational worship. With the growing ambition for anthems and solos and with an elaborate *Te Deum* too often by poor performance made a *taedium,* it is time to plead for a larger proportion of music that, while not poor and cheap, shall be democratic. "Let the people praise Thee, O God; yea, let all the people praise Thee."

There may surely be question whether, in the financial support of churches, there should not be appeal less to commercial and selfish considerations and more to Christian motives of loyal devotion, generosity, and sacrifice. In fact, the pew system, as an adequate means of support, has practically broken down. Few are the parishes where it has not to be supplemented by other methods and by yearly appeals to make up a deficiency. On the other hand, who can estimate how many that system has kept from the house of their Heavenly Father? In a city

church that is awake to its mission the appropriated pew, with its provision for comfortable and complacent selfishness, is an anachronism, an obstacle surviving from the past. When a new church is built, in place of pews put in chairs, and you have taken a long step toward making the church truly democratic. If it be really a question of private pew *versus* people, surely there will be no hesitation as to which shall be abandoned.

Aside from means and methods, the great company of Christians face to face with pressing problems of the time ought not even to seem to be dumb and impotent, paralyzed and past feeling. If they are rightly to face those problems, they need a vision of the opportunity, a widening of thought and purpose and renewing of spirit, a more robust effort and a fuller measure of the enthusiasm of humanity. The Church's task is not to be something apart, in the rear of the battle, only for them that are sore spent and wounded in the fight. Its service ought to be that not merely of the ambulance corps but of the column's forward march. When its stores of latent power have been fully developed, it will not be out of relation with the main currents of human energy. As in the

best periods of its past, it will be a force potent in the progress of humanity onward and upward.

The Christian estimate of the worth and meaning of human life should make men view with larger understanding and sympathy all earnest efforts for human uplift. To be specific, the Society of Christians may properly recognize what is common in its own aims and those of the trade-unions. Undeniably there have been on the part of the unions instances of folly, tyranny, and crime. The same might be said of the other side. Yet these associations of wage-earners have accomplished much which could not otherwise have been done. They are likely to be of immense educational value, not only through the learning that comes of making mistakes, but also through the inevitable uplift of minds earnestly working together at great problems. On good authority may be quoted a remark of Mr. Root when Secretary of State: "When I want a pastime, when I want to be stimulated, I go to a labor-union meeting and listen to a debate. I have never heard one carried on as well and so much real thought shown in a Fifth Avenue Club as I have in a labor-union meeting." If the labor organizations be headed by intelligent and disinterested leaders,

they might, as Professor Sumner* suggested years ago, be made capable of undertaking a number of matters now imperfectly supervised through government inspection; for example, sanitary arrangements in factories, protection from accidents in factories and mines, limit of age for children employed, hours of labor for women and children. In many communities it would be well for the local congregation to have its representatives approach the union with a view to certain mutual relations. The Church can afford fairly and freely to recognize the ideals of the unions, the results they have accomplished, and their possibilities of further service to humanity.

When all is said, however, there remains something which the Church alone is fitted to supply and must supply if true to its mission. The manifest design and ultimate destinies of Democracy, who may adequately describe? Yet its way is not the untroubled triumphant march which has been predicted and expected by a former generation. It is a way beset, in city and State and nation, by grave problems and perils. There is need of principles, of vision, of ideals and inspirations which are found in Christianity and which the Christian Church is bound to fur-

* "What Social Classes Owe to Each Other," p. 94.

nish. Democracy must not turn from its ideals of humanity or be false to human nature. A prime fact of human life is the inevitableness of religion. The faith of the Son of Man, with all its superhuman sanctions, is none the less the religion of humanity. Of that religion of humanity the Church is the organized expression and ought to be a visible embodiment and living voice, seen and heard of all men.

CHAPTER V

THE CHURCH AND THE SOCIAL IDEAL *

In the preceding chapter were presented some considerations touching the democratic ideal and the Christian Church. That subject it were impossible to consider to-day without taking account of the social quickening that characterizes the present age. The eighteenth century had its issue in the stormy assertion of individual right. The French Revolution was the catastrophe and cataclysm which marked the close of an epoch. There is not a little to bear out the contention of Mazzini, which he began as early as 1835 in a French Review, that the Revolution was "a practical summary of the conquests of the past, not a programme of future conquests." It is true, Mazzini also wrote: "The Revolution was directly descended from Christianity, . . . Christianity is the Religion of the individual." This gross misconception quite ignores those so-

* This chapter appeared in the *North American Review* for April, 1910, and is here reprinted without change. A wider view of Socialism finds expression in Chapter IX.

cial characteristics which are essential to Christianity and find embodiment in the very institution of the Church. The French Revolution, however, in its attack upon authority, proceeded upon the accustomed atomic and individualistic lines. Vague presentiments of the future there doubtless were. But the great principle of the coming age, association, was "an idea unknown to the official inspirations of the Revolution." The brute force of individual rights was "the one formula of every Assembly that controlled the Revolution." *

Individualism survived into the following century and found manifestation in the "Manchester School" with its doctrine of *laissez-faire*. But there prevailed a signal reaction. The nineteenth century, as a whole, was marked by the principle of association in nationality. Instances we see in Greece, Austria-Hungary, United Italy, these re-United States, Germany, the Balkan States, and Canada. As the nineteenth century was marked by political co-operation, so the twentieth century is thus far occupied with social co-operation. The pendulum has swung far over from the individualism of a former time. Moral progress always involves a finer

* Mazzini: "Thoughts on the French Revolution of 1789."

sense of right and justice, and the growing social sensitiveness is evidence of a progressive age. The added weight of emphasis upon social relations is the pressure of the finger of God, the insistence of the Spirit of the living God urging forward to better things.

We are evidently in a stage of transition. The questions at issue would seem to touch the rate of progress and the final goal. Undoubtedly there is to be a considerable enlargement of the functions of government. Some will think the wise and reasonable attitude is to welcome State action so far as it promises to help, and to oppose it so far as it seems likely to interfere with, the free development of manhood or womanhood in the nation. Others will think that the present system of wealth distribution is so far incompatible with justice and right that it must be done away with and give place to the collective ownership of productive property and administration of industry in a co-operative commonwealth. We are certainly moving. The question is how fast to go and how far, and whether it is better to proceed by methods of evolution or revolution. At all events, it is impossible to mistake the prevailing tendency of the age. Political problems now inevitably in-

clude social factors. There are social programmes taking on some of the characteristics of a religion.

We well may hesitate to plunge into the revolutionary scheme proposed by Socialists. In the first place, there recurs the old question between things visionary and things practical. The need of the latter, in fair measure, is suggested in the familiar rhyme:

> "She took in sewing,
> To keep things going,
> While he reformed the world."

Grave problems are not to be solved by clever theories and fine sentiments and brilliant hopes. The rainbow that spans the cataract will not serve as a bridge to cross the chasm. To deal with stubborn facts there is need of something substantial and practical. To elevate social conditions there must be a firm fulcrum; and that is found not in things as they ought to be, but in things as they are. It is easier to pull things to pieces than to put them together again, especially if it be an exceedingly intricate fabric the construction whereof is not thoroughly understood in every detail. In the proposed programme many things are to be considered. For instance,

what kind of men will obtain control of such tremendous power over the industrial life of a whole people, over the daily doings and the destinies of each and every individual?

Were it not better, in attempting to improve the vast mechanism of society, to go, as it were, step by step, making each readjustment or change in the machinery as it is seen to be necessary, and thus to proceed experimentally with a view to how it works? Such procedure may be stigmatized as opportunism. But it is in that way that the movement of democracy has advanced in England,

> "Where freedom broadens slowly down
> From precedent to precedent."

Indeed, so far as Socialism should make the sphere of personal liberty too circumscribed for it to live and move in, so far would it be at variance not only with the democratic ideal, but also with Christianity and that freedom for which Christ made us free. The social character of Christianity it is impossible to overestimate, because there the social never gets away from the personal. Christianity, while never individualistic, is always personal. It recognizes that persons are the stuff of society and that social strength must be made up of personal tissue.

It is a question to be asked and answered whether the Socialistic scheme, if carried into effect, would tend to the degeneration of this personal tissue or no, whether it would be favorable to the development, or tend toward the withering, by atrophy, of those characteristics of self-reliance, industry and thrift, and that energy in initiative and sustained endeavor, which are the very fibre of robust personality and, as such, essential to the vigor of the commonwealth.

Again, Socialism puts all the stress and strain of social regeneration upon the State. But the State is not the only social institution. Before the State comes the Family as the true unit of society. So far as Socialists assail the sacred integrity of the Family, so far has the Church a witness to bear on behalf of the Family as the basis of society, as furnishing the norm of social relations and as God's primary school for training therein.

As against a merely materialistic Socialism the Christian Church is to bear witness to the moral and spiritual purposes and destinies of human personality. With liberty won, the question remains, liberty for what? The free man is a force set free—for what end and purpose? So far as the Socialist scheme is limited to material welfare and confines its appeal to consid-

erations of self-interest, there might be question whether it be not a subtle expression of individualism, a turning up of the reverse of the same medal with as selfish a stamp. The Christian motive appeals to something quite above any sordid self-regard. The Christian purpose for personality aims at something higher than a general average of physical well-being and comfortable mediocrity. With this motive and this purpose, with its appeal to the high and heroic in human nature, the Christian Church is equipped to arouse corporate enthusiasm as no other agency could.

Furthermore, the Socialism that claims to be scientific and self-consistent is professedly based upon class antagonism. This is avowedly insisted upon as a cardinal doctrine involved in the nature of things, as a necessary law consequent upon an inevitable conflict of interests between employers and employed. This ground, it is true, has been departed from more or less widely by some recent writers; for example, certain of the Revisionist school of Socialists. Such departure, however, is not generally recognized as consistent with logical and genuine Socialism. Representative exponents of the system continue with no less emphasis to insist upon the "class war."

Here the Church of Jesus Christ has a witness to bear and a message to deliver. Peril threatens any society wherein class is estranged from and arrayed against class. Democracy cannot be healthy or safe where there is continual clash of classes. France furnishes unhappy illustration of conflicting elements. An evident need in democratic society to-day is of something that shall bring opposing elements together and bind man to man and class to class. The Middle Age guilds played a great part in drawing together the people of a town. It is not long since here in America master and men and apprentices worked side by side. New conditions of industrial life have taken away that personal contact, which is a wholesome thing for humanity. In modern society the evil is intensified by the specialization which divides men one from another and shuts them out from much mutual sympathy and community in thought. Science may tend toward a common level in the physical and material order, bringing accessories of comfort and convenience within the reach of the many. But as differences here disappear, there rise invisible barriers that more and more separate class from class. This insidious spirit of caste science does not withstand, being itself selective rather than democratic.

The menace to society and to the democratic ideal in the estrangement and antagonism of classes must be confronted by Christianity. Nothing else has the requisite inclusiveness and moral compulsion. Christianity is concerned with personality. But its revelation is a disclosure that personality implies more than mere single individuality. Its great purpose is personality taken up into brotherhood and corporate fellowship. Because it is personal it is, moreover, social. It means that, as John Wesley said, "ourselves and others cannot be put asunder." Christians must not be content to accept any doctrine of an irreconcilable conflict of classes. In its long eventful history the Church has brought to bear upon the world influences of emancipation and uplift, for example, on behalf of the slave, woman, the feudal serf. But it has for its mission not only to break yokes, but also to bring men together and hold them together in their freedom.

A watchword of revolution has been: "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." But in France an artificial equality which ignored personality made a hideous farce of fraternity and of liberty a most tragic travesty. With less talk about equality and more fraternity, liberty to-day might be largely left to take care of itself. A

half-century ago John Stuart Mill said: "But society has now fairly got the better of individuality." * We have seen, however, that it is still possible for individuals to get the better of society. We are learning the need of that genuine fraternity, brotherhood between man and man and between class and class, that finds in any advantages of man or class only enhanced opportunities of service to the common weal.

There is already, among the masses of wage-earners, something of a passionate fellow-feeling. Let a like fellow-feeling of humanity move, as I believe it is more and more moving, those at the top, to hear the cry of those beneath and look upon their burdens, and we may hope for a growing passion of brotherhood that shall be mightier than hatred and strife, and make for righteousness and peace and loving service. To this brotherhood the Church, as we have seen in the third chapter, is bound to bear a certain witness. There ought to be no possibility of mistake regarding the attitude and spirit of a Church that has been teaching each of its children, along with his duty towards God, that his duty towards his neighbor "is to love him as myself, and to do to all men as I would they should do unto me." Such an attitude and

* "On Liberty" (published in 1859).

spirit would surely prove effective to work wonders. There should lie our hope and endeavor, not in the perpetuation of class antagonism, but in finding some principle that should, instead of sundering, bring closer together interests that now seem opposed. Said the labor leader, Mr. John Mitchell, at Yale: "If I were asked to propose a solution of the whole vexed problem of modern industrial life, I should unhesitatingly advise a literal application of the Golden Rule." Those be weighty words. In that attitude and spirit Christian effort might reasonably be directed toward making the combinations both of labor and capital a beneficent enginery to advance the brotherhood of men.

The Church of Christ cannot identify itself with the Socialistic scheme. In nature and purposes that scheme is economic; the Church is spiritual and personal. The Socialistic scheme for society aims at the economic transformation of environment. The Church's aim is the spiritual transformation of the persons that make up society. Socialism aims at reconstruction through revolution; the Church at progressive reform through evolution. They work on quite different lines.

This diversity, however, in aim and operation

does not necessitate antagonism in spirit. While the Church of Christ, following His example, will not identify itself with any political or semi-political scheme for a revolutionary destruction and new construction of the fabric of society, it ought not to withhold genuine sympathy with some things to be found in the movement known as Socialism; for example, its frank and fearless facing of evils, and, again, certain principles like the superiority, so eloquently argued by Mr. H. G. Wells,* of the spirit of service over the spirit of gain. Especially will be discerned hovering above the general movement a certain ideal. For we have now not the democratic ideal alone. From the seething ferment of our time slowly has been emerging the social ideal, which is taking shape before our eyes. This ideal, brooding over the chaos of the age, beckons on to some better thing God has for man.

In this social ideal there is involved nothing that is unreasonable. It means at the outset simply a recognition of certain things, namely, sufficient food and raiment, decent housing and time enough to rest and to think, as the normal inheritance of humanity. It means refusal to be content while large numbers of human beings

* "New Worlds for Old," Chap. V.

here in our midst have not these things; while, for instance, little children come famished to school, and while other children toil through the hours when they ought to be at school or in the night-hours when they ought to be asleep, and while the wages of any working women are so low as to involve fierce temptation to sell their sacred honor. The social ideal is, after all, simply that Christian ideal of the personality in all sorts and conditions of men, now with more imperative cogency compelling loyal and large-hearted endeavor that it shall be in completer fulfillment realized.

If it be true that Christianity in principle means not individualism, but solidarity; if Christianity, while not ignoring personality, yet has, as its ideal, personality fulfilled in social relations; then, in a time like this, of transition from individualistic principles and ideals, the Church of Christ has plainly before it a task in the world. It is no time to yield to that old besetting temptation to hold aloof from contact with the world. The sociological trend of thought and life to-day is a realization of essential characteristics of Christianity and makes rightful demand upon Christians.

Certainly the Church is to refrain from seeking to allay the restlessness and fever of social

discontent by administering any anodynes that superinduce social lethargy. Its plain task is to heal, tone up and invigorate the social system, to quicken and guide those social promptings and aspirations, and make men know assuredly that Democracy means the wider opportunity and the larger obligation with respect to social service. For accomplishing this task the Church has no mere maxims: it ought to bring to the ferment of social discontent and strife the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

It should be evident beyond question that the Church is bringing the Spirit of Jesus Christ. That would require that it be itself thoroughly possessed by that Spirit. The problem that immediately confronts the Church is not to Christianize Socialism, but first to socialize Christians, until their ideal principles shall be real and ruling principles, until they obey the rule of principle and not contentedly rest in sentiment. For instance, the sentiment of pity for misery does not suffice when there is appeal for justice on the ground of wrong. That is an appeal to which the Church corporately, and Church members personally, cannot afford to be deaf and irresponsive. Nor must there be repose in any abstract sense of justice or vague generalities and commonplaces about just dealing or mere

vaporing indignation against wrong. There is need of definite application of the Ten Commandments to life and society, the seventh and eighth as well as the sixth; nor should it be forgotten that one of the commandments forbids covetousness. It is for the Church with prophetic voice to rebuke covetousness and greed of gain, selfishness and injustice as sins.

It is for Christians to endeavor to translate the social ideal into actual conditions. Their Christianity is to be definitely applied in specially directed effort against particular and concrete ills and wrongs. Our Lord upon earth dealt in no vague spirituality out of relation with men's actual life and the ills they were suffering. There is a lesson to-day to be learned from any movement, so far as it manifests definite aims and directed effort against concrete evil, and so far as it manifests faith in the possibility of redressing wrongs and remedying ills, faith in the *possibility* of progress in social relations and conditions. Then, confronting the possibility, is all the latent personal power in the membership of the Church. Thence ought to go forth what dynamic energy to deal with certain evils, for instance, the wicked waste of life in child labor! In questions touching humanity the Church is not to be a hindrance to

progress. Christ's people are to be lined up on the right side of such questions, in support of reasonable legislation and reform. We have had examples of definite dealing with concrete ills, at any rate so far as to face the actual problems, notably in Chicago.

The Church of the Son of Man is for man, and nothing that is human should it deem foreign to itself. Its sphere is as wide as the life of man and includes the range of his social and industrial life. Failure here means betrayal of trust. To such failure is to be attributed the indifference to the Church on the part of many working men. The masses of the wage-earners have respect for Jesus Christ Himself. Still they will cheer His name. Still His personality is potent. Still He draws men to Him. If men are alienated from the Body which was to do His work in the world, it must in some measure be through the fault of that Body. The Church is not always clear as to social injustice. The Church has not always been the champion of the poor and oppressed. The Church has sometimes regarded not the wrongs of the poor, but been blind and deaf and mute. The Church is not manifestly before men's eyes a spiritual republic, the commonwealth of man.

If the Church is to leaven twentieth century

Democracy and preserve what is good therein, we have freely to recognize, and to endeavor, so far as in us may lie, to realize the democratic and social ideals as bound up with genuine Christianity, as ideals whereunto the Church must be loyal, if it would deserve the names Christian and Catholic. Yes! The Church needs these ideals to keep it true to Him who loved to call Himself the Son of Man. Democracy needs the Church to save it from becoming worldly, materialistic, selfish, and base. Let the Church be true to the design of its Founder, loyally and worthily bearing witness to these principles wrapped up with the revelation committed to its trust and the mission given it to accomplish; and let Democracy be thus won by the Church to consecrate itself to Christ's inspiration and guidance onward and upward: then we may hope, and in hope work, for the new earth wherein shall dwell righteousness and peace and joy.

CHAPTER VI

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP *

THE Kingdom of God, or Kingdom of heaven as the Gospel according to St. Matthew calls it, involves something more than either an idea on the one hand or an institution on the other. It means life, the fulness of life where God's reign is accepted. Our Lord likened it to the leaven hid in the meal. It works not only extensively but also intensively. Like the yeast in the dough, it has a certain vitalizing power whereby anything in contact therewith is permeated and quickened until you may almost see it "rise."

On the other hand, above and beyond democratic methods of government, is an ideal regarding human nature. This ideal, which we have already considered, may be described as the recognition of the average man, without re-

* This chapter was a sermon delivered before Columbia University in the city of New York. This may account for some of its language, which has been little changed.

gard to length of purse or pedigree. This democratic ideal has been defined, in Chapter IV, as the recognition of the personality in all sorts and conditions of men. It has this personal basis. Were it based on any mere abstraction, it could not long survive. Its vitality depends upon the real relation of a person to others in the community of persons.

Equally personal is the Kingdom of heaven; whether it be within men or in their midst, it always and inevitably comes into relations with them personally. These relations of the Kingdom, moreover, are present and immediate. The proclamation of its herald was: "The Kingdom of heaven is at hand." That Kingdom of heaven is not an event postponed to some far off consummation in a timeless world. It is a present reality nigh at hand. Although it is a Kingdom not of this world, it is nevertheless here and now in the world. It is no flying machine, to soar serenely above the world and its ills and perplexities. It is rather a force at work in the world with direct application to its tasks and problems.

Thus the Kingdom of God inevitably comes in contact with the democratic principle, which is, indeed, partly its own product, so far, that is, as the conception of the value and possibil-

ties of human personality may be traced back and found to be a conception essential to Christianity. Of this contact, what might be expected to be the import? What does the Kingdom of God imply as regards democracy? It ought to mean influences of socialization and of idealism.

First, it socializes the democratic principle. We have in the preceding chapter glanced at a certain kind of democracy which America received from France and the agitation for personal rights which culminated in the tempest of the French Revolution. That democracy, which was essentially atomic and individualistic, is not the only or the best type. There is another kind of democracy which may be traced far back through the centuries to the Hebrew State. That was a theocracy, a Kingdom of God. But it was also a commonwealth with certain plainly democratic features.

After the kingdom of Israel came the Christian Church, which is not to be identified with the Kingdom of God, but is an instrument and means thereof and may be considered as the Kingdom of God in the making. At its foundation those democratic principles which center in the significance and inherent worth of

human personality were minted, stamped, and issued as current coin of the Kingdom to pass between man and men. Worn thin and effaced, in time they became ancient coins and later were unearthed and their value rediscovered and declared anew.

This democracy of the Kingdom of God is based upon the value of each and every human person. While thus essentially personal, it is in no sense individualistic, and is at variance with anything that is individualistic. So far as the democracy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had been characterized by individualism, had held that aggressive selfishness and far-reaching cupidity were to be let alone, had meant individualistic competition and grasping monopoly unrestrained and unregulated, so far were the principles of the Kingdom of God incompatible with it. Indeed such individualism is incompatible with the genuine democratic ideal, which is to be found in Christ's revelation of the sacred value of human nature and the oneness of all who share it. Any democracy that is false to fraternity falls below its highest type and genuine ideal. Such the Kingdom of God cannot leave the same as it finds it, but must mean its socialization.

To say that is not to identify the democracy of the Kingdom of God with any socialistic scheme or propaganda. It is at once more universal and more particular, more universal in the breadth of its principle of fraternity, more particular in its doctrine of each person's liberty. It cannot be content to reduce personal distinctions to a dead level, or sacrifice liberty to equality. None the less is the democracy of the Kingdom of God a revolutionary force. Indeed a revolution is in progress. It is attended with little noise and demonstration. Like all things of the Kingdom, it comes not with observation. Silently for the most part its advance goes on. It is inward and spiritual. The outward framework and institutions of society continue as they were. Nevertheless it is a time of transition and of crisis. The thoughts of many hearts are revealed. Men are learning that no man lives unto himself, that lives touch each other, are linked and interlocked, that for weal or woe men are brethren. An era of individualism is passing. Far and wide a change of men's heart and attitude is wrought. It is the Kingdom of God in your midst.

The Kingdom of God means not only socialization but, moreover, influences of idealism.

Like a pure breeze from some loftier region, it brings into our close atmosphere

"An ampler ether, a diviner air."

It widens the view as it carries tidings and conviction of something beyond the objects that lie within a narrow prospect. It means a new and farther horizon and an illimitable vision of things unseen and eternal. This idealism is needed, first, to counteract that materialism which is a natural tendency in a democratic society. Where the presumption is in favor of the judgment of the many, and there is no distinctly counteracting influence, there is inevitable gravitation toward the merely material. Money is the thing most desired. Commercialism becomes dominant. The energies of the people are chiefly absorbed in the pursuit of gain.

There may be vast accumulation of wealth and material might, and an abundance of luxuries and the accessories of comfortable living. Not in these things, however, lies the secret of genuine and enduring national greatness. There is warning in the example of other mighty nations that have come and gone, blinded to higher things by the god of this world and so given over to their doom. Material prosperity may demean and degrade. Is not our Amer-

ican life to-day a by-word for its mean monotony of vulgar materialism? That is not all there is here, but it is what chiefly impresses other nations as the national characteristic.

Let us awake to reality. Our national greatness consists not in the boasted bigness of what "America" denotes; so many square miles of territory, so many millions of population and billions of wealth: but rather in what "America" connotes; ideals of humanity, freedom, and justice, to be realized in a future that beckons on to vaster issues. These ideals the Kingdom of heaven furnishes and impresses, bringing what more than aught else this country needs. The Kingdom of heaven brings God and His righteousness. This nation will continue to be great according as it is not disobedient to the vision, as it remembers Him who has led this people by a way they knew not, as it heeds the message and responds to the call to higher things, and seeks first the Kingdom of God and its ideals.

The Kingdom of God means idealism, moreover, as against pessimism. A materialistic democracy is bound to pass from exultant and boastful self-complacency to an ignoble and cynical pessimism. In the actual results, thus far, of American democracy there is not a little

to perplex, discourage, and alarm. It is often a question whether our democracy has tended to level up or level down. If the present level of our politics is indeed the highest attainable, if the suffrage is a commodity to be dealt in, if lawmakers can be bought, if legislation can be purchased by special interests, or procured through direct or indirect intimidation, if law is for sale, if municipal misgovernment is to be a demonstration of the breakdown of democracy, if it is all a question of money-making and self-interest, if things must continue thus; we are indeed in evil case. Such conditions lead, if there be not some high faith and hope to sustain, only to cynical recognition of evils and ignoble acquiescence therein, and apathetic despair of any improvement. Who cannot see a real danger to this country from the mood that declares: What better can be expected? They all do it. It is politics. Any reform would be temporary and followed by a relapse, what use in trying? It is not worth while.

From these things, however, we may look to something else, something higher and better. We can discern great principles and great issues. A materialistic democracy lacks dignity and worth. The Kingdom of heaven brings the redeeming element of dignity, of worthiness, of

significance and hope in ultimate destiny. It brings a lofty idealism that saves from such pessimism. It reveals God on the side of the democratic ideal. It reveals the profound principles at stake, shows the tremendous greatness of the issues involved, to rebuke our despair of democracy, awaken our faith in its possibilities and ultimate vindication and triumph, and brace us to renewed endeavor and battle.

Any belief in such a Kingdom may well disturb the apathy wherein so many have been content to sit and look on as mere spectators, and rouse them to bestir themselves. For the Kingdom of heaven coming on earth means for earth a continual and well-nigh infinite possibility of betterment. As a matter of fact it has, in contact with human society, ever and again shown itself to be more than a mere dead religion of the past. It has come with the momentum of a moral vitality and energy, communicating to society a dynamic quality potent for recovery and renewal. The Kingdom of God is an ideal order seeking realization in human life. For human life collectively it means inevitable advance, uplift, and enrichment. Thus it not only supplies the spur and inspiration of idealism. It brings also ideals to

be realized, and for their realization it brings definite obligations.

One's citizenship in the Kingdom of God ought to import much, then, as regards his citizenship in the democratic State. First, he should be a factor in the formation of public opinion. There is an evident distinction between the suffrage and public opinion. Doubtless many who from one motive or another vote yet contribute nothing to public opinion, indeed have no real opinions of their own to contribute. But a man ought not only to cast his vote but to give his influence for the right. The voters elect the representatives who make the laws and the executive who carries them into effect. Good laws, however, may be passed for unworthy reasons and with no intention that they be enforced. The best laws are of no avail if behind them there be not an intelligent and righteous public opinion. This ought to be a result from the Kingdom of God among men. The character of a community must depend upon the persons who compose it. This is true particularly of the democratic community or commonwealth. Especially if the functions of the democratic State are to be enlarged, it is the

more necessary that the individual citizen's personal influence count its full value for the right.

This personal contribution to public opinion ought always to count against that pessimistic and cynical disbelief in democracy already referred to. The mere democratic form of government no longer exercises a spell of potency. It has been discovered that it is not in itself alone an immediate panacea for all ills. Nevertheless the true democrat will speak in the language of faith and hope. It is a language derived from the Kingdom of God, and in results already here attained we have good ground for the faith and hope. The curse of slavery no longer hangs over our land. The spoils system that reigned from Jackson to Grant has been overthrown. So competent an observer as Mr. Bryce has recently said: "The American people may be satisfied that there has been a decided turn for the better in its city government, and may expect that the scandals which have disgraced it in the past, will soon be overcome."

Against other evils also is needed the idealism of the Kingdom of heaven. There we have that reversal of earthly estimates and standards which is often the chief defence

against threatening ills. It has come to pass that American democracy manifests a tendency to plutocracy. That last word dictionaries of forty and thirty years ago did not contain. It is to be found in every one to-day, and, in some, the word, plutodemocracy, showing that the thing has made its way hither. To give an example of the tendency, in a certain State it is matter of public knowledge that candidates for the office of Governor have contributed sums of money, from nearly twenty to over forty thousand dollars; so that the office would seem to be beyond the reach of a poor man, no matter how well-equipped and competent for its duties. If plutocracy may be defined as government by rich men, then such a condition of things is more plutocratic than democratic. The condition is by no means peculiar to the State referred to. Elsewhere the figures have been much larger. That it should have become anywhere in America impossible for a poor man to hold high office is an evil surely which calls for drastic remedies. The time, I venture to think, has come for a law which would forbid any candidate for an office to contribute any money whatsoever to any person or fund connected with the political campaign. Where there prevails this actual disloyalty to the democratic

ideal, there is imperative necessity somehow to rehabilitate that ideal.

Most important is the increase of a public sentiment of respect for constituted authority, and reverence for the sacred majesty of law. The sacredness of law is a cardinal principle of the Kingdom of heaven. In this connection let me refer to a flagrant evil. Since Magna Charta the cornerstone of freedom has been the principle that every person is entitled to the enjoyment of his life, his liberty, and his property, unless forfeited by due process of law. That this principle should ever be defied and overthrown while frenzied delirium of passion is substituted for judicial procedure and a mob constitutes itself at once judge, jury and executioner, is an instance of the failure of government by the people and for the people and a positive menace to the existence of free institutions. The frequency of lynching is both a shame and a peril in our national life. It is an evil never to be justified. It behooves the loyal citizen to do all that in him lies that the stern and relentless condemnation of public opinion shall uphold and vindicate the majesty of law until the savagery of mob vengeance shall have become a thing of the past.

Good citizenship will array itself not only on the side of the authority of law but also on behalf of the true unity of this people. This was formerly menaced by sectionalism. The era of sectionalism has happily passed. To-day the body politic is threatened by the development of distinctions, antipathies, and jealousies of race and of class. These distinctions, while not to be ignored, surely may be taken up into the larger unity of our broad American life. Important is a public opinion that shall be able to transcend any ignoble racial injustice, the pettiness of personal or class interests, and the provincialism of prejudice. Such a generously large and enlightened public opinion is among the manifestations of the Kingdom of heaven, which means righteousness and peace.

It is the Kingdom of heaven that makes the democratic ideal to be something far transcending the mere form of government and to become a confession and creed of human brotherhood with unmeasured demand of duty from the individual to the community and commonwealth. Thus we come to the citizen's participation not only through the influence of his opinions and convictions but by direct and active effort. In the Republic of Plato, which is the noble pagan analogue of the Kingdom of heaven, the in-

quiry regarding the just man, "He will not be a politician," is answered: "He will . . . in that city . . . which exists in idea, . . . In heaven . . . there is laid up a pattern of it methinks, which he who desires may behold." * St. Paul has the same idea of a heavenly citizenship. Therein is consecration for political citizenship.

Consecration. What does it mean? An essential element of a man's consecration is the giving of himself. The Kingdom of heaven, to use our Lord's vivid phrase, "is come upon you." That impending, albeit unseen, order of higher realities lays hold of this lower order of things; and at once conventional standards of decorum dwindle. Imperatively demanded is something more than personal propriety. By the stir and push of socializing forces the man is driven from the covert of a small, selfish respectability out into a wide field of large and generous endeavor. He is driven into the common service.

The professionalism which has threatened to degrade politics into a trade has thriven because of the withdrawal of amateurs often in disgust. There is need of men who will play up and play fair. Out of the need sounds now a trumpet

* End of Book IX.

call to young men to go into politics. To heed the call costs, and it is well to count the cost. It costs contact with dust and dirt. But the dirt will not stick to men who are themselves straight and clean. There is required sacrifice of ease and comfort, of taste sometimes, of pride perhaps, but not of principle. There are sordid and repellent details. But those may be transmuted by lofty personality when influences of the Kingdom of God inspire a life of service. There is the risk of defeat, but defeat cannot daunt the manhood that is "baffled to fight better." There may be, now and again, things that drive the iron into the soul. But the call of the Kingdom of God is to endure hardness and not shirk the cross. Yes, there is dire need of that stubborn devotion to civic service and political righteousness which will take hold, close in, and not let go. Whence shall the need be supplied if not from the dauntless daring of the young manhood of our land? The principles of the Kingdom illumine with significance the privilege of service to city, State and Nation.

The Kingdom of God means always something more than the merely economic or material. For democracy it means the *quality* of citizenship, that moral and spiritual element,

that element of character, which befits the democratic ideal and which alone comports with the dignity of the democratic State and insures its security. Self-aggrandizement as the only aim, self-indulgence as the rule of life, a lack of the sober sense of responsibility, a lack of conscience, increasing corruption, degeneracy and dishonor, are fraught with disaster to free institutions. There is solemn need to ponder Mr. Bryce's warning: "The more democratic republics become, the more the masses grow conscious of their own power, the more do they need to live not only by patriotism but by reverence and self-control, the more essential to their well-being are those sources whence reverence and self-control flow."

That organized fellowship we call the Church is closely related to the Kingdom of God and should be its expression and instrument. Corporately, it is to bear witness to the Kingdom of God and His righteousness, a witness uncompromising and, where need be, specific. The Church is not to play the part of a political party or push a partisan propaganda. But to be above partisanship does not mean to remain aloof from momentous questions touching human weal and woe.

The Church has not only this corporate wit-

ness but also, through its members who are citizens, a diffused influence which ought always to make for the higher standard of citizenship. Theirs ought to be a finer loyalty to that democratic ideal hovering over the political and industrial world and invested with somewhat of the significance of the Kingdom of God. The self-sacrifice that in former ages was lavished upon Crusades and religious wars is now devoted to another kind of battle for that principle of democracy which, as widened, uplifted, and illumined by influences we have glanced at, is certainly a worthy cause. It is for the Church so loyally to lift up and carry to the front the standard of self-sacrifice (none other than the old banner of the Cross) as to rally to that banner and to muster under its discipline these various forces of devotion and enthusiasm, that they may together, marshalled in high-hearted endeavor, march on to new conquests for the Kingdom of God.

CHAPTER VII

THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD

In the last chapter we saw that the Kingdom of heaven has a penetrating and transforming power like the leaven hidden in the dough. The yeast is working not only in politics but also in the world of industry, and the results of its working may already be discerned. It is not inaccurate, it is not sentimental, to speak of the Kingdom of God as touching and laying hold of the industrial world. It is the language of sober fact. That Kingdom is not altogether supramundane and remote from present conditions and issues. While not of the world, it is certainly in the world. The Kingdom comes on earth as in heaven. It brings hither its golden rule, its royal law, its knitting of men together in membership one with another, its principles of service, of burden-bearing and of sacrifice.

Thus the dawning vision that stirs men to-

day with the conviction of better things that might be is, whether always recognized as such or no, a vision of the Kingdom of God as that Kingdom comes in human society. Descending out of heaven from God, it brings of its own to earth. With its own potent force it brings to bear its dominant factor of righteousness upon the solution of questions that recur with vexing and troubling pressure until they are settled right. It is at this very time producing a spirit that refuses to be content with any palpable wrong, that has ear attent for other message than the survival of the strong and exploitation of the weak, that is ever seeking some better thing, more just and true to a living God of men. His Kingdom, let us now note, brings influences that are surely socializing. Indeed we may find those influences slowly shaping something that shall be really more social than Socialism.

At any rate men are less and less content to accept as the normal industrial condition a state of continual war between capital and labor, with an occasional armed truce. They will dream their dreams of more amicable relations. Well may we welcome any signs of better relations. Such signs are not wanting. Let me instance the large department store of William

Filene's Sons in Boston. Some time ago this firm of its own accord fixed upon a minimum wage. Here there is a co-operative association which has power to initiate or amend any rule touching the efficiency of the employees. There is also an arbitration board to decide all questions of disagreement as to wages, dismissals or any point of controversy between employee and employer, or between one employee and another. It has settled several hundred cases, and a few years ago a professor of law who had made a study of some of them said that, for average good sense and justice, these cases compared well with some ten thousand civil cases he had studied from the court records. This is one of many instances pointing to a practical participation by employees in the management of the business as regards certain internal details.

Indeed, there are reasonable grounds for the hope of approaches to a more definite and substantial association of capital and labor in the future for mutual advantage. There are indications that there is possible, instead of the Socialist co-operative commonwealth, a co-operative industrialism in something like a partnership between capital and labor. Significant in this connection are these words, in the

Report* of a committee of stockholders of The United States Steel Corporation made on April 15, 1912: "The adjustment of the relations between employer and employee is a task for men of sound minds, reciprocal natures, broad sympathies and courage, men who believe that the future may be made better than the present. May it not be reasonably hoped that such men, whether they be officials or wage earners, may more and more be found working together to bring forward the day when employer and employee shall enter into a common administration of industrial interests." First, however, must be removed any standing grievances or continual causes of suspicion and ill-will. For the basis of such association must of course be, not patronage on the one hand and on the other affected servility or ill-concealed resentment, but the firm foundation of justice and just dealing between the parties.

One continued cause of contention has been the question of liability for accidents to those employed. The radical revolution in industrial methods and conditions wrought by the inventions of complicated machinery and the introduction of steam and electricity as motor power, has

* Page 9.

involved a vast increase of danger to the laborers. Particular dangers are incurred by those working on railroads and in mines. The nature of the problem is evident when we learn on the authority of those who have made most careful investigation that in one year, 1906-07, 526 men were killed and 509 were injured by work accidents in the single county of Allegheny, Pa.* When we are informed that of these victims of industrial accidents nearly half were American born, seventy per cent. were skilled laborers, and sixty per cent. had not yet reached their prime, we begin to appreciate the loss to the community and to society. The tremendous gravity of the problem is appreciated when a writer tells us that within the past decade, in one year, more than one out of every twenty men employed on the railroads of this country was either killed or maimed, and that more than half a million workmen have been killed or injured in a single year.† It is generally recognized that a result of modern machinery has been to fasten, so to speak, the worker in dependence upon the machine, and thus make him less free to leave it for other work. More-

* "Work Accidents and the Law," by Crystal Eastman, pp. 10–15.

† "Charities and the Commons," vol. xvii, pp. 791, 803, 807.

over, there is not only the risk of accident, but also the hazard to health in the close confinement of crowded factories and in the development of diseases peculiarly consequent upon particular employments. Here, then, we have the appalling fact of an enormous number of deaths and physical disabilities incident to modern industry.

That there should be no compensation to the victims or those dependent upon them seems palpably unjust. In America the inadequacy of legal redress has been notorious. There are certain principles of the common law which, as applied, have favored the employer's exemption from legal responsibility. These principles are only too familiar to those who have sought compensation by legal methods. There is the doctrine of the assumption of risk, whereby one is held by his entrance upon the employment to assume and consent to the risks of the trade. This principle has been stretched to cover not only the ordinary and obvious risks, but also extraordinary possibilities of hazard. If the workman knew of these, his continuance at work is taken to imply his consent to the risk. There is taken for granted an assumption of such risk by an implied contract, although there is usually no contract at all even in the hazardous indus-

tries, and the workman works at the trade simply because no other course is open to him. There is also the principle of contributory negligence, applied to an employee just as it would be to an utter stranger who might incur injury.

There is, again, the fellow-servant rule, applied to injuries received by an employee through the negligence of another employee. This rule is based upon an English decision in 1837 in the case of a butcher's boy who was hurt by a wagon driver in the butcher's employ. Arising in that simple case, it has been applied to very different cases, to modern factories with their complicated machinery and hundreds of workmen, and to railroads with thousands of employees. Under these principles, as interpreted by American courts, it has been estimated that not more than ten or fifteen per cent. of injured employees have been able to obtain legal compensation.

Not only is the situation of the workman thus deplorable, with no redress except by recourse to law, but our legal methods have proved enormously wasteful of the time of the courts and of witnesses; wasteful also of money, as the employers pay out large amounts for defence, and, when they pay damages, only a small part ever reaches the victims themselves. The method

also is slow, by reason of the proverbial law's delay. There is, moreover, the production of friction and antagonism between workmen and employers. Many of the latter now take out insurance against liability. Thus, when a workman is injured, he is referred to the insurance company, and it becomes a mere business matter, with the element of humanity eliminated altogether.

The result is much fruitless litigation. The financial loss falls chiefly upon those least able to bear it, the injured workmen or their dependents, who often become burdens upon public or private charity. At best the operation of the law is uncertain and unequal, as the award varies with different juries, so that the element of speculation is frequently involved. Thus the method of redress by suit at law is unlikely and unfitted to insure uniform justice or full satisfaction to either of the parties involved. Convinced of this, many thoughtful and foreseeing men are looking toward the elimination of litigation and the substitution of methods of compensation that shall work automatically.

A number of conspicuous companies, for example, the United States Steel Corporation and the International Harvester Company, have undertaken to disregard the costly

processes of the law and voluntarily to make provision for accidents to their workmen, sharing the burden with them. In many cases the employees also contribute to such fund. Contributions by employees are advocated as furnishing an added motive to beware of carelessness and so tending to the prevention of accidents. In favor of payments by the workmen this is also to be said: it associates them with the employer, and such association of employer and employed in united action to provide insurance brings them into the closer relations so much to be desired.

This feature is prominent in a thoughtfully worked-out plan recently proposed by the Cheney Brothers, the famous silk firm of South Manchester, Connecticut. The plan contemplates no alteration in the present legal rights or liabilities of either party. That is to say, the workmen are still to retain all their rights by common law or statute. The plan aims at an automatic insurance of the workmen as a matter of right, and not of charity, and in a fairer manner than through either a court or an insurance company.

In all these plans not only is it the aim to remove a cause of contention and enmity between employer and employed, but there is also

manifested the growing recognition of a principle of justice involved. Civilized nations are discarding the idea of liability based on fault and are recognizing the risk inherent in modern industry. It is recognized, moreover, that, while the victim of accident has to bear the physical pain and disability, there should not rest upon him or his family also the burden of proving a case at law or else bearing the entire financial loss. It is felt that there ought to be a fairer distribution of the loss. It is recognized that there may properly be provision for the wear and tear of humanity as well as of machinery. Thus it is seen that the financial burden ought in justice to be shifted from the individual sufferer to the industry and ultimately fall upon society at large.

There is, furthermore, a growing conviction that these principles ought to find expression in more adequate legislation, which shall raise the matter above those common law rules to be level with recognized demands of humanity and justice. This conviction has found expression in federal legislation, touching interstate commerce carriers, which, in placing liability upon the employer, deprives him of the defence lying in the fellow-servant rule and the assumption of risk, and considerably modifies the defence of

contributory negligence. Montana was the first State to enact a law basing the liability of the employer on the hazard of a particular employment, that of coal mining and coal washing; while of all the States Oregon is the most advanced in its standard of prevention of accidents.

Many States, at first chiefly in the West, have passed employers' liability laws. In New York the commission on this subject presented, in March, 1910, a voluminous report of 271 folio pages, recommending, as an avowedly first step, tentative legislation in the shape of a compulsory bill applying to certain especially dangerous employments. Their recommendation was embodied in a statute, which was based on what would seem to be a principle of equity, namely; that any loss incidental to a hazardous business should be borne not by the person on whom it may happen to fall, but by the person who profits by the business. This statute, however, the Court of Appeals pronounced unconstitutional, on the ground that it contravenes the provision that "No person shall . . . be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law," a provision of the State Constitution in accordance with the Fourteenth

Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

In support of my main contention as to present public sentiment, I venture to assert, with the utmost respect to the court, that this decision was received with wide disappointment. The fact of this decision emphasizes the need of extreme care in framing compensation acts, as the constitutional provisions and principles of other States are in this regard like those of New York. It may necessitate constitutional amendments to make way for the progressive legislation that is demanded in the interests of justice. On the other hand it may be possible to devise by some legal method an implication of contract between employer and employed to abide by a compensation act.

At any rate it is to be hoped that technical obstacles may somehow be soon removed in order that such legislation may be secured as shall bring up the condition of this matter in America nearer to the very much better condition in Europe. The New York statute referred to followed, as far as it went, the example of English legislation. In observing experiments abroad, methods are found to follow two chief lines. In Great Britain the employer

is liable for compensation for accidents to employees. In Germany the legislation begun by Bismarck has gone a long step in advance. While in England the employer is compelled to insure his workman, in Germany he is furthermore compelled to insure himself against the risk. For such insurance, employers of the same or kindred industries must unite in mutual associations. This grouping of industries in classes seems at once fairer and surer than the method of a flat charge throughout. The German plan also provides, as the English plan does not, for contributions by the workmen. The German methods, after being in operation for a quarter of a century, are encountering some criticism, and, whatever their efficiency in Germany, will probably in America be regarded as too paternal and bureaucratic.

On the other hand, under the English system compensation might sometimes fail through the insolvency of an individual employer. In order to make compensation sure and in order to equalize the burden upon employers, it may be found possible to adapt certain features of the German system and provide for mutual insurance that should be compulsory and, so far at least, under the authority and regulation of the State. Any system of compensation ought to

include prevention of accidents and to that end ought to involve co-operation of employers and employed, and so be thoroughly and consistently democratic.

With whatever variation in details of method, this general movement here outlined, in the direction both of voluntary action and of legislation, promises an improvement upon the present condition which offers the possibility of revenge for a few, and uncompensated misery for the many, who are victims of accident. Aiming at protection for all by automatic insurance, the present tendency bids fair to do away with much friction and strife between employers and employed and to open the way to better relations.

To touch upon a cognate matter, the provision, in one way or another, of pensions for old age, is an accepted principle in many nations to-day. It is inevitable that the principle should make its way in the industrial world. It is receiving recognition from many corporations. Some pension plans involve no payment or contribution from employees. In other cases employers and employed are uniting in co-operation for this purpose. To give an example, the plan lately proposed by the Cheneys includes such mutual association to secure pensions for

old age and long service. According to this plan every dollar contributed by the employees is returned to them plus about a dollar and a half from the company, without any deductions for operating expenses. The pension is made commensurate with efficiency and thrift, in accordance with sound business policy, not out of benevolence or pity, but in just recognition of the value of long and faithful service. The plan was suggested as a reasonable working basis upon which, after trial, changes may be grafted. Taken as a whole it was presented by the company "as the execution of a constructive policy which will accrue to the benefit of all, and work toward a closer alliance between the interests of the company and its employees."

CHAPTER VIII

INDUSTRIAL WAR OR PEACE

INTO the industrial world the Kingdom of God imports influences not only to socialize but also to idealize. Putting the premium of distinction upon service, to the world of industry it brings a touch which transmutes while it illumes all with the glories of service. It means the moralization of capital, the ennobling of labor. It means the uplift of both together, to something better than ever-recurring conflict. It may mean that the great processes of socialization shall find their completion in idealism; that these vast organizations of labor and combinations of capital shall, some day, in league and alliance, become a beneficent enginery to conquer the final obstacles to the brotherhood of men.

Idealism will seem to some altogether out of place in the world of industry. There are still those who, while not adherents of Socialism, yet follow the line laid down by its great prophet.

Karl Marx scanned the situation and outlook with the eyes of an avowed materialist and from the standpoint of economic determinism. Now we may grant the importance of economic conditions and concrete facts. We may see that effective force must take its rise out of conditions rather than mere theories and find its fulcrum in substantial fact. Yet, while recognizing the physical and economic basis of life, we may question the merely materialistic interpretation of life, for the reason that all of human life cannot be construed in terms of physical and mechanical law.

The philosophies of materialism, including its social philosophy, have been left behind as the world has moved on to something better. Men see to-day that there are such things as ideas and ideals and moral forces to be reckoned with. There are men to-day who, while their feet are on the solid ground of fact, have, from their standpoint of things as they are, a large and luminous view. It is the vision of things as they might be, of things as they ought to be.

For these questions pressing upon society to-day have not only a scientific and economic but also an ethical import. They have their aspect not merely material but also human, and their aspect not only toward man but moreover

toward God and His righteousness. His Kingdom is to be reckoned with in the industrial world as elsewhere. Hence the persistence of questions that will not down; for example, those on behalf of children whom greed of gain is robbing of sleep and schooling, sunshine and pure air; on behalf of the race of the future as imperilled in the overworked women of to-day; on behalf of the worker's right to a living wage and a day of rest. To such questions the Kingdom of God brings power of uplift and light to transfigure, until they transcend considerations touching the interests of persons and classes, and appear invested with moral compulsion.

So, contemplated in that same light, the democratic ideal is seen to transcend self-interest and class interests and ultimately to involve the end of class antagonism. We have glanced in the preceding chapter at the remarkable movement toward the elimination of what have been continual causes of grievance and contention between employers and employed.

Anything would seem to be desirable which would tend to associate capital and labor for mutual advantage. Such a result would seem likely to be attained if to the workman might be allowed to accrue some share in the profits of the industry. The possibilities of profit-

sharing lie in its effect upon the employee, human nature being what it is, in its promise as regards quantity and quality of product, saving much waste of time and material as well as wear of implements, and a lessening of labor disputes. Such results are to be looked for from admission of the worker to a stake in the business.

Toward solving the labor problem, profit-sharing goes some way so far as it serves to overcome antagonism between employer and employed by humanizing their relations. Into the problem it brings the human and personal factor in its recognition of the workers as something more than the employer's machines, as men of like nature with him and entitled to a right recognition of some common interest between them and him. The omission of that human factor has been a fact only too familiar. The past century saw too many instances of the type made famous by Carlyle. "Plugson, buccanier-like, says to them: 'Noble spinners, this is the Hundred Thousand we have gained, wherein I mean to dwell and plant vineyards; the hundred thousand is mine, the three and sixpence daily was yours; adieu, noble spinners.'"

Turn to a great captain of industry in our day, and hear Mr. Andrew Carnegie say:

"Every employee should be an owner, and

then there would be no trouble. If I were to go back into the steel business that is the first move I would make. I would inaugurate profit-sharing with the men."

The principle of labor's participation in profits had been recognized by Turgot in the preceding century. But practical profit-sharing was begun in 1842 by Leclaire, a Parisian decorator, who showed the qualities of genius. His example has been followed, and with success, by many firms in France, and by a somewhat smaller number in Great Britain. In America, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury, Gallatin, advocated the principle and seems to have made experiments in it. The history of the movement in its earlier stages has been thoroughly told by N. P. Gilman, in his work, "Profit Sharing." * This country was slower than Great Britain or France to take up profit-sharing; but in the last third of the nineteenth century there were many experiments and a large proportion of failures. The plan has been given up sometimes by the employer, sometimes by the employed. In one case, with which I was somewhat familiar, after a very generous scheme had been working well for two years, the men abandoned it to join a

* Houghton Mifflin & Co., 1889. The same author in "A Dividend to Labor," 1899, traces the movement to that date.

general strike, thereby forfeiting, at a low estimate, a dividend of $11,000 due within a month, and $8,000 in wages. That, however, it may be noted, was so long ago as 1872, when the principle in America was in its infancy and had not established its strength sufficiently to withstand strong pressure from without. In a fair number of instances the plan has survived the experimental stage. In recent years there has been adoption of the principle on a large scale, with cash payments out of mutual earnings and in some cases also distributions of stock.

Where the profit-sharing has not succeeded, among the causes have been failure in some instances to earn any profits at all, and in others dissatisfaction of the men with their share. Behind all, however, and of essential import to the real success of the plan, must be the questions: How and why, and in what spirit, it is proposed to the men. There is to be encountered a perhaps not unnatural suspicion. Mr. George W. Perkins, who sees the possibilities of profit-sharing, has frankly said,* of some plans that failed, that they "did not embody a true, an honest, and a fair spirit of co-operation. A secret, perhaps almost an unconscious, purpose existed to benefit the business in question out of propor-

* Before the National Civic Federation.

tion to the labor employed in the business; and no such plan having such a purpose can permanently succeed, for the selfish points in it will work to the surface sooner or later and cause failure."

It is evident the plan must be presented as a measure of justice and right dealing, not of paternal benevolence. The United States Steel Corporation has since 1903 offered its men stock for purchase at a lower price and with guarantees which were calculated to give and, in fact, have given the men a very handsome return on their investment. In the annual statement of conditions, however, have occurred certain phrases, touching the employee of the corporation, for example, "Has shown a proper interest in its welfare and progress," "Whom it shall find deserving," phrases which, however they may have been actually construed, seem to go behind the doing of satisfactory work, and are suggestive of a paternalism inconsistent with genuine democracy.

To profit-sharing there has been a general opposition on the part of labor organizations. Sometimes there may have been an instinctive fear that such adjustment would threaten the very business of the unions. But, should the wage-war be succeeded by lasting peace, the

unions might still perform most valuable service. A chief objection is explained by the fact that profit-sharing proposals have often seemed to be associated with opposition to the principle of labor organization. In some instances the avowed purpose has been to destroy the unions. In some cases participation in the benefits of the scheme has been expressly conditioned upon withdrawal from membership in the unions. In other cases it has seemed to be a device to lure men from them. It will not in the long run meet the need to present any profit-sharing plan, however generous, which may justly be considered as a bribe to induce the men to abandon the labor organizations for the sake of getting what may benefit themselves, but not the mass of their fellow wage-earners. It is natural that men who believe that the general improvement of their condition depends upon organization should resent attempts even indirectly to interfere with the strength and efficiency of the organization of labor, and view with suspicion schemes which seem to look or be likely to work in that direction. It would seem possible to find some way of furnishing a dividend to labor which should be compatible with due recognition of the right of labor to organize.

The difficulty did seem to have been success-

fully met in England by Sir Christopher Furness, at his great shipbuilding yards at West Hartlepool. In October, 1908, he proposed that the men should become limited copartners by holding shares in the capital, on easy terms of payment. These shares were to bear a fixed interest at 4 per cent., and, furthermore, after apportionment for the interest on the capital at 5 per cent., and for reserve and development funds, whatever profit might remain would be divided between the employees' shares and the other shares. Over and above the monetary aspect was held out the promise of amity instead of friction, of cordial relations of co-operation. To this end was proposed a works council, to be composed of representatives of the firm and of the employees, and to include also outside representatives of the trade-unions. This was to be a medium of intercommunication and of mutual discussion. There was to be no strike and no lock-out. If through the council any issue could not be settled, there was provision for a court of arbitration.

These proposals were, after discussion, deliberated upon by the several unions, and by a large majority accepted. So was launched a copartnership which admitted the workmen to a share in the profits and recognized the principle of

association in unions. It seemed an encouraging example of that which Professor Jevons declared would be the best of all trade-unions, the union between labor and capital. For 1909, dividends were declared of 10 per cent. to the regular stockholders and 9 per cent. to the employee stockholders. But, in April, 1910, it was announced that a majority of the workmen had voted against the continuance of the plan, a large number of them not voting. The reasons for this action, so far as I have been able to learn them, would seem to be only incidental and not to be essentially involved in the principle.

Notwithstanding discouraging instances, the horizon is bright with promise. The general principle of profit-sharing has begun to emerge from the stage of crudity and experimentation. There may yet be mistakes and failures. But some of the ablest men of our time are deeply interested and engrossed in study of the problem. We may reasonably hope there may be devised methods whereby to surmount the difficulties and to apply the principle in such wise that, while not a patent cure for all industrial ills, it shall mean a long step toward better relations and a better spirit.

In industrial as in international relations,

there recurs the persistent question whether war is a normal necessity. The "class war" has been a watchword of the Socialists. By the majority of them it is still insisted upon, at least verbally, as a basis of the cause they advocate. It is proclaimed as a necessary law. The doctrine of Marx and his immediate followers was that, so long as there are employers, the employed must be their wage slaves. Between them must be enmity. Their interests are in conflict. What the one side gains the other must lose. There can be no mutual gain. Why not? It is a query which, I venture to think, has never been conclusively answered and is fortified by observation of the results of fair profit-sharing.

It remains a question whether class consciousness necessarily, inevitably, and forever must mean war. Something better than this is surely conceivable. Something better than this seems not impossible. It has been my aim to show that indications are not wanting of something some day coming which, because it is to rest upon the essential unity of man with man and their interdependence, promises to be more genuinely and fundamentally social than the Socialism that is avowedly based upon the antagonism of class to class.

Significant in this connection would seem to

be the National Civic Federation, bringing together as it does representatives of capital, of labor, and of the general public on the same platform. It was inevitable that it should meet with criticism and denunciation from certain organs both of labor and of capital. Perhaps to be expected at this stage is the opposition of some labor organizations, for instance, the action whereby Mr. John Mitchell was forced to withdraw from the Federation. Unfortunate as such an episode confessedly is, none the less can one who really believes in human nature help hoping for much yet to come from the mere bringing together, into relations of mutual comparison, discussion, friendly understanding and co-operation, of reasonable men who represent differing and opposing interests.

There are signs of promise in regard to conciliation and arbitration. Such a sign is to be seen in the working of a federal law of 1898 known as the Erdmann act, applying to disputes on inter-state railroads. For some years the law was inoperative, but latterly it has been frequently invoked to settle serious disputes, and in most cases successfully. It has been found to provide for mediation through confidential conferences with one side and the other before bringing both together, and also, when neces-

sary, for friendly arbitration that has proved satisfactory and effective. Its methods evidently presuppose a high degree of organization both of labor and of capital, as is the case in the railroad industry; but its signal success indicates that like methods may be applicable to other industries.

In the general movement we have been concerned with there is the economic side. Men are learning from experience that it is poor policy and bad business to be forever fighting, that it pays to have other relations than those of mutual suspicion and hatred. We catch glimpses, moreover, of another side. As we see men turning from competition and conflict to cooperation, we get intimations of something else. It is the stirring of impulses and convictions in regard to right dealing, brotherhood, helpfulness from man to man, and bearing burdens together. It is that touch of our better nature that even in the industrial world makes men kin. It gives good reason to hope for some issue looking toward the reintegration of society, and the reconciliation of warring elements. In that day which, however distant, is, we hope, destined to dawn, when instead of perpetual strife there shall be just arbitration and agreement in

common purposes, when to industrial war shall ensue peace; then, in this transcending of solely selfish and clashing aims, and in this bringing of contending wills, and interests that seemed conflicting, into concordant harmony, shall be found the highest value of the industrial process, seen thus to serve higher than material ends, and itself to be an instrument of the Kingdom of God.

CHAPTER IX

MOVING—WHITHER?

It looks like the coming dawn of a new day. There is the stir of unwonted manifestations of life. For this new day what are the "probabilities"? What is the likelihood as to the trend and the issue? Whither are we moving with the times?

The rising tide of the Socialist vote here and in Germany, howsoever to be accounted for, constrains me to confine this inquiry to the social movement. It is necessary to turn back to Karl Marx, because he was the first to undertake a scientific analysis and interpretation of the social movement. His economic determinism, which explained the sequence of events solely by physical conditions, has been left behind. It would exceed my limits to discuss his theory of labor as the measure of value, which it could not be unless it were the sole source of all value, as plainly it is not. Nor can be discussed his theory of "surplus value," nor of capital as

"dead labor, which, vampire-like, becomes animate only by sucking living labor," as "the instrument of production which capitalists employ for the exploitation and enslavement of laborers." All rests upon his fallacious theory of value, which is generally admitted to be untenable by Socialists to-day. Yet that theory, thus rejected, is the foundation on which they all have built. For example, that attractive writer, Mr. Spargo, in a book published so late as 1909, writes: "The producers of wealth are exploited by a class of capitalists, draining from them a 'surplus value.'" * But, that foundation thus insecure, all the Socialism built upon it totters to a fall.

Toward the close of his imposing work, "Capital," Marx, in a memorable passage, which became the evangel of Socialism, prophesied the process of development which was to culminate in social revolution.† His daring prophecies time has disproved in important particulars. First, Marx predicted the swift approach of a

* "The Substance of Socialism," p. 82.

† "Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working-class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, united, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital

social catastrophe, with the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat." This was an expectation natural for a man who was himself large part of the volcanic outbreak of 1848 and, in the succeeding decades, a homeless exile. Marx and Engels, who with him issued "The Communist Manifesto" in that year, ate the bread of bitterness and drank the dregs of hate. Small wonder that their vision was clouded by revolutionary passion. But the violent revolution they foretold seems no nearer after sixty years.

More striking has been the fate of the prophecy that the concentration of capital would diminish the number of capitalists. Notwithstanding the enormous accumulation of capital there is abundant evidence that the number both of large capitalists and also of small property holders has steadily increased.

Likewise has fared Marx's prediction of the increasing pauperization of the proletariat. It is abundantly proved and generally granted that the poor are not growing poorer, but actually

becomes a fetter upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."—Das Kapital. Translated by Moore and Aveling, pp. 788, 789.

are much better off than when Marx wrote. His prediction has been fulfilled only in a respect he did not contemplate, the psychological; that is to say, they feel poorer. This, however, is according to a law of human nature, which is made to aspire after higher and better things.

The fallacy of fundamental elements of his theory having been exposed, the system of Marx is largely discredited. Indeed, its collapse has been asserted by a high authority, himself not without strong socialistic sympathies, Prof. Werner Sombart, of Berlin, in these words: "Here and there a stone was removed from the edifice of the Marxian system; a whole army of moles, hailing from the socialist as well as from the bourgeois camp, endangered the foundations on which it stood, until at last the whole structure collapsed as silently as the Campanile in Venice." *

The year 1897 divides the dogmatic from the critical epoch of Socialism. In that year appeared the keen criticism of Marxian doctrines by Edward Bernstein, who became the leader of the Revisionist school. Since then many who call themselves Socialists have been more moderate, conciliatory, and opportunist, not scorning

* "Socialism and the Socialist Movement," translated by M. Epstein, p. 64.

to adopt but readily adapting themselves to, political, parliamentary, and reforming methods.

Meanwhile it was natural there should be, on the other hand, beginning characteristically in France, a development of extreme doctrine in what is known as Syndicalism, set forth, also in 1897, by Georges Sorel. The movement includes other writers of note and could claim a recent French premier, M. Briand. In France and Italy *syndicat* means an association of workmen. Hence the name Syndicalism, for it is not dependent upon any literary advocacy, but is really a movement of the working class. Its method of operation is through trade-unions, It attempts their organization on a large scale, the union of an entire industry rather than of particular departments. Its avowed policy is to secure for the workers the ownership of the industry and to vest the control of production and business not in the State but in the unions, which are to be the training schools of producers. It is the familiar and attractive theory of co-operative industry. The only question is, will it work; will the producers by themselves prove competent to put and push their products on the market? Meanwhile it is claimed on behalf of the Syndicalists that their organizations really are training schools, aiming to increase

the technical efficiency of the workers and their pride in good work and so to improve the quality of the product. It is, moreover, claimed that, practically, certain great organizations of workmen are demonstrating their competency to take control of an industry; and, as instances, are cited the Bottle Blowers' Industrial Union of Italy and the Industrial Union of Italian Railwaymen. With further development the idea of such co-operation may indeed be fruitful of result.

While Syndicalism is thus unobjectionable theoretically, its practical programme is fraught with import of disaster. It is altogether opposed to the peaceable and moderate sort of Socialism that figures as a political party. It is militant in its advocacy of force and violence. Its weapon of war is the general strike, that two-edged sword that cuts both ways and inflicts so much suffering. It strikes not to get more wages but to paralyze the existing order. Its aims and methods spell revolution. Syndicalistic methods have been, furthermore, sinister so far as they have savored of dishonesty, and have included shirking, shamming, and sabotage, things which mean not only ruin to employers but the moral degradation of workers.

Until recently Syndicalism found its field in

France, Italy, and Spain, but its influence has lately been felt in Great Britain. Even in France it has not enlisted all the wage-earners. The majority of them do not belong to the unions, and of those who do the Syndicalists include only about half, although increasing in number. American trade-unions have been by no means on the side of Socialism, and among its strongest opponents have been prominent trade-unionists, for example, Mr. Gompers, Mr. Timothy Healy, and Mr. Raymond Robins. It remains to be seen whether the unions here will be influenced by this foreign and widely divergent left wing of Socialism. It is represented in this country by the Industrial Workers of the World. This organization has already in some instances incurred the hostility of the older unions. The somewhat anarchistic tendencies of Syndicalism would seem to prevent its having the promise of the future. Even Socialism in America has repudiated its methods. The national convention of the Socialist party at Indianapolis, on May 17, 1912, braved the opposition of the Industrial Workers of the World, rejected the programme of revolutionary violence as a substitute for practical legislative and administrative procedure, and added to its constitution a new section beginning thus: "Any

member of the party who opposes political action, or advocates crime, sabotage, or other methods of violence as a weapon of the working class, to aid in its emancipation, shall be expelled from membership in the party."

It would seem worth while to seek to understand Socialism as it presents itself here to-day. It is not a thing of rigid cast-iron. It is a movement pulsing with vitality, changing with continual development of thought and not all of it destructive. Although Marx in "The Manifesto" * summed up his theory in the sentence "Abolition of private property," many of his professed followers to-day would not socialize all possessions. They distinguish between production and consumption. While demanding public ownership of means of production, they would recognize private ownership of things for private use and enjoyment, like a home with its furniture, library, pictures. Their programme involves the public ownership of capital, the private ownership of wealth as a means of individual well-being. Some would even find a place in the socialized State for small farms, small shops, and handicrafts. Socialists to-day are not communists but collectivists. Collect-

* Authorized English translation, 1906, p. 34.

ivism, of course, characterizes modern society. A familiar fact is the substitution of collective and corporate for individual control of business and industry. Socialism means a step further; the vesting of ownership, as regards the means of production on any large scale and of distribution, no longer in private hands but in the government. This is the essential substance of Socialism, and on this rest its merits as a system offering the salvation of society.

In addition to what has been already said, some things in this connection are worthy of consideration. Socialism avowedly still proclaims class struggle as the means of doing away with classes altogether. Yet in what "The Manifesto" * describes as "the dangerous class, the social scum, that passively rotting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society," some Socialists are frank enough to confess there is likely to be found a persistent problem. In the socialized State certainly there would be the classes of rulers and ruled. This is a difficulty which Socialists recognize and are wrestling with. Some of them propose rotation in office. But could a continual succession of mere amateurs prove competent for the tremendous tasks? Inevitably there must come to the top a direct-

* Authorized English translation, p. 29.

ing, governing class, in whom would be vested the control of all this immense business of production and distribution. Thence would result distinctions more pressing and galling than any to-day.

For, in place of democratic government, there would be an absolutism of a new sort. There would be a change from plutocracy to bureaucracy. The abuses of the money power we are not without hope of bringing under effective regulation. But the socialistic State would mean, instead of "capitalism," an officialism without remedy. We hear of "wage-slaves" to-day. But if in the last resort a man may not choose his own career, and must do the kind and amount of work he is commanded to do, how would his lot essentially differ from slavery? How the State, as sole proprietor, could get all its work done without despotic commandeering of some lives, is a serious consideration.

A question not without interest is: what would become of the freedom of the press? A paper would have to be run with no income from advertisements, which would have ceased with the disappearance of competition. Who would pay for printing and publishing? If the State, what would the production be more than an offi-

cial organ or bulletin? If private persons publish, how could they afford to pit themselves against the State in outspoken criticism; or how could the State afford to tolerate a press that should arraign its business methods, scale of wages, and like vital matters of policy?

The compression of individual units into a governmentally administered system of industry and commerce would involve heavy cost in respect to personality. It is difficult to see why it must not mean some loss of personal energy in initiative and effort. A further danger would be diminution of a true social or public spirit. Treating of the Athenian State in the time of Pericles and of its subsequent decay, Mr. Bosanquet,* near his close, observes: "Economical Socialism is no bar against moral individualism. The resources of the State may be more and more directly devoted to the individual's material well-being, while the individual is becoming less and less concerned about any well-being except his own." There would be grave risk of deterioration of the fibre and of enfeeblement of the force of character under such a system. The decay of Rome began when government provided "bread and games." The free dis-

* "Essays and Addresses," p. 70.

tribution of loaves made loafers. The once stout Roman fibre was debilitated and debased.

It is indeed a mild and rose-water Socialism that is presented to us by certain writers to-day. For example, Mr. H. G. Wells, in a current magazine,* sketches pictures of life in "The Great State": Agriculture a kind of general summer picnic; as to the offices, a preference for "a certain amateurishness"; nobody obliged to work many hours a day, but for the rough and dirty work conscription for a year's service; hints of a feminine citizenship, with the endowment of motherhood; and a new type of family, a mutual alliance; how permanent the pact, and whether children are to be allies or perhaps act as an advisory board, we are not told.

The more thoughtful observers, even among Socialists, are now looking for the emergence of a better social order through processes of evolution rather than through revolutionary upheaval and catastrophe. In present conditions is the preparation for those to come. The most effective schemes for uplift will begin with things as they are.

We may seem to be moving in a Socialistic

* *Harper's Monthly*, January and February, 1912.

direction. That, however, is true of a certainty only to this extent: Our world is becoming more social, in the sense of being less individualistic. We are daily becoming accustomed to things, in school and workshop and business office, that sixty years ago would have seemed unthinkable. It is evidently an age of combination, of corporations, syndicates, and trusts, and of unions and federations. Notwithstanding any attempts to put the clock back, there seems a reasonable hope of moving forward, out of the chaos of mere individualism with unrestrained competition and continual strife, into the more cosmic order of regulated combination and co-operation on a large scale.

In short, we are coming to a more organic conception of society. There is increasing recognition of the need of some reintegration of the life of men. There is deepening conviction that in its essential reality the social body is an organism with its parts vitally related, so that the health of the whole is involved in the health of each and any part; that various elements of society ought not to be in continual conflict but should be in harmonious relations within the life of the whole; that there must be found a reconciliation of clashing classes in some kind of co-operation, a co-ordination of State action and

corporate and private interests, and an organic and vital correlation of the individual and the social wills.

Human life, however, in thus becoming more organically social, is not going to be less truly personal. Personality is the consummate outcome of the age-long process of evolution, the prime and distinctive endowment of human nature. Any development which should ignore or undervalue, suppress or in any wise lower personality would be not genuine progress but retrogression. It is to be hoped and reasonably expected that the further process, the evolutionary correlation of social elements into a more consciously and explicitly organic whole, will be not mainly through governmental authority repressing personality, but through wholesome liberty of development, wherein personality shall find fullest realization in social relations.

Such a process would mean much in many ways. It would mean the free play of personality in its diversity of gifts and powers. It would mean everywhere allowed and encouraged originality and liberty of initiative and achievement under such regulation only as would prevent unfair advantage and insure others from exploitation and any injustice. It

would mean for organized labor less of tyrannous compulsion and more of large-minded leadership; an abandonment of the policy of reducing work to a low level and limit of productivity; an intelligent welcome of scientific management with its possibility of increased product and pay and shorter hours, provided there be no speeding at the expense of humanity. It would mean free and full recognition that capital and labor have other relations besides those of antagonism; that labor needs capital, that the more capital there is the greater the demand for labor and the higher its wages; that capital needs labor, and labor efficient because not dissatisfied but interested. It would mean employers who will rate a man higher than a machine and reckon not only the cost of the product in money but also the cost in terms of humanity. It would mean employers enlightened enough to see that there is coming something wider than any autocratic or oligarchic control of industry, that it does not belong to the employer to "run my business to suit myself," but that in a sense it is the business also of the men employed in it and of the public to be served by it; that no paternal care for the welfare of workers, howsoever benevolent, will suffice; that the day is passing when men

will be content to labor under conditions determined for them and regarding which they have not some voice and vote themselves.

In the socialistic State, men who worked for the government might find themselves more helpless than they are now. Indeed, against individualism there is a remedy other than that proposed by Socialism. Present evils might be best met, not by more of government, as the Socialist dreams, but by more of brotherhood, between man and man and between class and class, than he will at present hear of.

This would mean that the representatives of capital and labor should get together, no longer as enemies, but on the ground of some mutual interest, and work the complicated problems out together. Is that a wild dream? It is true the situation has recently been grave enough. But evidently things cannot long go on thus. Evidently we have had war enough. Even to-day signs are not wanting of something else, signs of promise as to better understanding, and even something like co-operation between combinations of capital and federated labor. The National Civic Federation, bringing together representatives of employers, of organized labor, and of the general public, holds the position,

not that the interests of capital and labor are identical, but that those interests, while not identical, may be mutual, and in most cases admit of adjustment and reconciliation. In November, 1911, at Atlanta, the convention of the American Federation of Labor by an overwhelming vote rejected the demand of Socialists that members of labor-unions should retire from membership in the National Civic Federation. Significant might have been the outcome of the labor battles at Grand Rapids in the plan of an organized alliance between the Furniture Craftsmasters and the United Furniture Craftsmen, provided it had not seemed to be one more scheme aimed against the labor-unions. It is true the unions have sometimes abused their power and failed to abide by agreements. It is probable, however, that fuller recognition would tend to make them more responsible, as has been the result with railroad men. At any rate, there is sure to be war so long as combinations of capital refuse to recognize combinations of labor. When the right of workmen to organize for collective bargaining shall be freely recognized, and for that right they will no longer have to battle, then it is to be expected that they will be more ready to recognize the

rights of non-union men, who now seem to them traitors, and will be altogether more amenable to reason.

A wisely constituted Federal Commission on industrial relations might do much in preparation for a new epoch. There is ground for the hope that one day may be seen at least the beginnings of a true industrial democracy which shall secure at once the liberty of each and the welfare of all, and find a general and fraternal interdependence not incompatible with wholesome personal independence. Such an outcome would be more social than the Socialism that, compressing individual units into a vast economic system, would result in a mere aggregation of atoms and be individualism under a new name. On the other hand, this vision of the future contemplates a society made up of groups of persons associated together. There is created a certain community of mutual service as men come together in relations of dependence upon each other, and as each group is associated with other groups in mutual dependence within the State or Nation. Thus economic interdependence, under conditions bettered as suggested, would tend to knit men together in organic relationship. But, under governmental administration of industry and transportation,

each citizen being a shareholder in the one great producing power, the State, such mutual relations of interdependence between men would be far less likely. Dependence upon the State, as general employer, provider, and distributor, would make against that common consciousness of mutual dependence which might otherwise be effective to bind men together.

This new order would be more genuinely democratic than aught the Socialist offers. It would be a social order transcending Socialism in the one direction and in the other. It would be more intensively democratic in its full recognition of the essential worth of each man by reason of the personality that is the distinguishing attribute of human nature. It would be more widely democratic in its perception of some fundamental unity deeper than all distinctions of class or race or fortune, a profound basis for thought and labor on behalf of humanity.

Over against the dreams of the Socialists may be cherished the vision of a divine goal of human progress. That new order of things, seen afar off, involving the development of the social organism and at the same time not suppressing but rather developing and enriching personality, is none other than the Kingdom of God coming on the earth, slowly, little by little. Nothing

else than that rule of God's righteousness can suffice. It involves social relationship. It is a Kingdom. But it is a Kingdom of persons. It alone affords deep foundation and high sanction for the democratic ideal, in the equal solemnity of all human lives notwithstanding any inequality in natural endowment or outward fortune. It alone reveals that unity which, because spiritual, is vital, a vital force to build up a truly organic social structure, and is also the divine secret of a genuine brotherhood of men. It alone, with its new valuation of all values, can at once dignify and spiritualize labor, moralize capital, exalt above wealth the commonwealth, and realize the poet's vision

"Of joy in widest commonalty spread."

It alone can furnish cogent reason for respect and honor to all men. Peculiar to it are deep sources of unfailing interest and sympathy, enthusiasm of service and unsparing sacrifice on behalf of any and every being made in God's image and redeemed by Christ.

For this high-hearted, hopeful, and unstinting endeavor America offers opportunity and a field of promise beyond aught seen hitherto. It means something when one of our nation may hear such testimony as this from foreign lips:

"Signor,—I beg your pardon. I have said to you often that your country has no pictures, no music,—that it cannot make gods out of Carrara marble. That is all true I still believe—but—it has made a man out of my son Rocco, and that is true art—the grandest, the noblest art." *

The true glory of America lies in loyalty to profound principles and august purposes of that Kingdom of God which means at once the binding of men together and the fulfillment in each life of the divine design for humanity.

* "The Broken Wall," Edward A. Steiner, p. 219.

DATE DUE

BONEBRAKE SEMINARY LIBRARY

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN HN64.B82 1912
Brewster, Cha The Kingdom of God and Ame
3 0645 0004 9232 8